

BAP

H894

COPY 1

Liturgy of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. 111

SCB

9871







THE
BAPTISM of BELIEVERS

By IMMERSION,

Proved from the Scriptures, and vindicated against the Attacks of a late Argument between an ANABAPTIST and a METHODIST.

By PHILIP HUGHES.

1 Pet. 1. 18. *Redeemed—from your vain Conversation received by Tradition from your Fathers.*

Isai. 29. 16. *Surely your turning of Things upside down shall be esteemed as the Potter's Clay.*

To teach all nations what of him they learn'd
And his salvation ! them who shall believe
Baptising in the profluent stream.

MILTON.

Printed for the AUTHOR, M,DCC,LXXXIV.

THE

P R E F A C E

To the CHRISTIAN READER.

My Friend, and Brother in Christ,

FO R your edification and information the following sheets were penned. As you have been made a partaker of the divine nature, you have a disposition to *follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth*; so that you want not a desire to do, but only a knowledge of the will of our supream Law-giver.

The design of this therefore, is to direct, confirm and establish you in *one* of the precious ordinances of our most adorable Redeemer, viz. *Believers Baptism by Immersion*. Some years ago, there was published in Virginia a series of dialogues between Mr. Scripturist, and Mr. Traditionist; which was intended as an elucidation of the subjects and mode of baptism, by an anonymous author. Some time after this there came out a piece published by a member of the church of England, intitled, *An Argument between an Anabaptist and a Methodist*; which was designed as an answer to the former. How far this late author has succeeded in his attempt, is the subject of our present enquiry. It seems he was dragged into the controversy by the importunity of friends, having no ambition to commence an author; especially considering the meanness of the piece, and the difficulty of replying to it with christian decency and temper: He also considered (as he tells us) what the wise man says, *Pro. 26. 4.* "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like him. By which words

words (says he) I understood, that it is often best to answer things of a trifling nature, by *silence* and contempt." * What pity it is this author ever changed his mind ! had he taken the wise man's advice and answered the dialogue with a profound silence, it is thought by many who even hold with Infant Baptism, that he would have contributed much more towards supporting that cause, than he has in all the abundance he has said. However, upon a view of the next verse, "*Answer a fool according to his folly lest he be wise in his own conceit,*" he was stimulated to the onset, and indeed he has so literally answered a fool according to his folly, that however much folly he might find in the dialogues referred to, he has furnished out a sufficient quantity in the argument to turn the scale in his own favour.

However, he tells us he had something good in his intention, which was at least to "mortify the pride of his antagonist." § I suppose by detecting, confounding and confuting all his arguments. But I am made almost to despair of this good being done, especially when I see the most weighty arguments (far from being answered) passed over by the most *pitiful evasions* or *trifling equivocations*. Yet it is almost enough to force a smile, from even gravity itself, to see what a *dust* he beats up round about him. Behold him entering the field of controversy like Goliath of Gath, having one to bear his shield going before him, † and sufficiently testifying his disdain for his opponents ! hear how he boasts of his military prowess and skill ! "*My principal business (says he) has been to drag them out of their subterfuges ; to oblige them to rally their forces that we might see their strength, and the numbers they talk of.*" This piece of *generalship* succeeds it seems and promises a certain victory. Let us attend to the consequence. "*By this manœuvre the weakness of our enemies was soon discovered ; and fighting them with their own weapons, they were so galled, that they were glad to get off in the best manner they could.*" ‡ That is, as he relates

* See pre. p. 9. § See pre. p. 10.

† See letter to the publisher prefixed ‡ Pre. p. 12.

lates the matter ; but we positively deny that any such conquest has been obtained as yet ; and for him to assert that victory has declared on his side, and that his enemies are obliged to make a shameful retreat, is but a mere gasconade. He has not made us so very sick || as he supposes ; and though he so far surpasses us in *generalship*, we confide in our *New-Testament troops*, who are all *volunteers*, none of them being pressed into the service. We are now ready to open a second campaign.—Our army is in the highest spirits—neither have we hid from his presence, nor fled from his strokes—nor do we feel or fear what he has done or can do. Our standards are yet hoisted in the field, and there is not one amongst us who feels the smallest inclination of striking to this formidable hero. Nay, so far from that, we have again rallied our forces and are determined not to retreat till we have (thro' divine assistance) levelled his fortifications to the ground, routed him from his strong hold, and fully discovered to the world his weakness, and the vanity of all his boastings. This champion seems chiefly to value himself for answering the *Anabaptists* (as he call us) “ *in their own way* ;” * which, as he intimates, could not be effected without “ *moving often from place to place, backward and forward* ;” † “ *condescending far, grovelling, stooping low*,” and “ *raking in the dirt*.” ‡ If this be answering them *in their own way*, it must be acknowledged he has done it to purpose, as it may appear to the judicious. And, perhaps, the accurate reader will see that he has moved without much regularity ; condescended to grovel considerably, and stooped so low as to be engaged in very dirty work.

The argument referred to so evidently carries its own confutation with it in the wilful misrepresentations, false charges, and gross absurdities with which it abounds ; that it seemed almost needless to reply ; however, to silence his vain boastings, and for the sake of those who are truly desirous of knowing and doing their duty to

A 5

their

|| P. 38. * Pre. p. 10, 11, 13. † P. 13.

‡ P. 11.

their dear Redeemer, and who perhaps have never closely attended to what the scriptures say on this subject, lest these should be misled by the sophisms and false glosses in this dialogue, I have attempted a reply; and I think it a duty which I owe to God my Redeemer, and the souls of mankind, to vindicate the truths of the gospel of Christ when ever they are struck at and opposed.

Therefore, to preserve that order and decorum which Christ has established in his church, to enlighten your understanding in one of his sacred institutions, to stop the supercilious career of this writer, and shew that his dogmatical expressions are not to be taken for absolute demonstrations, I have made the following remarks.

And now, my christian reader, I would first request of you to address the Throne of Grace by the prayer of faith, that Christ may anoint your eyes with eye-salve that you may be enabled rightly to distinguish between truth and error; and then compare what I have written to the standard of truth, the word of God; and if I have not spoken according to the *law* and the *testimony* believe me not; but if I have, do not reject it; *For the words which I have spoken (says Christ) shall judge you at the last day.*

May our whole lives be one continued scene of conformity to God's revealed will, that so when Christ who is our life shall appear we may appear with him in glory. And if the mite which I have now cast into the Gospel treasury should contribute to this valuable purpose, that you may reap the benefit, and God the glory, is the ardent and sincere desire of,

Your servant in the uncorrupted Gospel of Christ,

PHILIP HUGHES.

[7]
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
PRINCETON
REC'D APR 1881

T H E

BAPTISM of BELIEVERS, &c.

TH E *characters* brought together on this occasion, says the writer of the letter to the publisher prefixed, * are aptly pitched upon—aptly indeed! one a *Methodist* who it seems has some of his *peculiarities* to broach together with infant sprinkling; as if the Baptists were the only persons who did not affect his *Armenian* notions; the other an *Anabaptist* of his own creation, very zealous against infant sprinkling, but his abilities very small. He gives up to his antagonist upon the smallest attack, and can bring only three scriptures in support of his cause, and quotes two of them wrong.—One would imagine from the manner in which this author depicts them, the Baptists (*Anabaptists* he calls them) were all *Crows*, and the Methodists all *Swans*; as he speaks no good, but a great deal of evil of the *former*, and nothing but good of the *latter*. But he might have reflected that *comparisons are often odious*; and the wise man would have taught him this modest lesson, *Let another man praise thee and not thine own mouth; a stranger and not thine own lips*, Prov. 27. 2. And were the Baptists as bad as this writer would insinuate, (tho' it is a small matter to be judged of his judgment) yet, according to his own decision, "If the Institution be good in itself, it must not be rejected because some of the persuasion are wicked."

In the first page of the argument now before us, the *Methodist* proceeds to relate his *Experience*; in which the name of *Christ* is not mentioned, nor any thing of his perfect righteousness, nor his fulfilling the law and sa-

* See p. 6.

tisfying

tisfying divine justice for and in the behalf of sinners, nor the least discovery of his infinite fulness and compleat sufficiency to save as the mediator. Now, had I, or any other Baptist minister with whom I am acquainted, been for baptizing of him, we should have questioned him more particularly concerning these important subjects. However, the Baptist is represented as being ready to receive him, and says, "I love you sincerely: I could freely give you the right-hand of fellowship. But *one thing now* and all is well"—This one thing you must know is *Baptism*; from which he would insinuate to the world that it is the constant practice of the Baptist-ministers to press it upon the minds of their hearers to embrace their baptism from the consideration that all would then be well with them—That is, only be baptized and all is well; you have nothing more to do or fear; you cannot now be lost; you may rest perfectly satisfied altho' ever so negligent and remiss in other christian duties.

Whether he had done us justice in this representation, I leave those to judge who are well acquainted with our constant preaching and the manner of our discipline. It is well known that we constantly affirm, that those who have believed should be careful to maintain good works—And that a continued scene of conformity to the precepts of christianity is one of the brightest evidences of our inward and unfeigned piety. Neither do we lay any greater stress on baptism than the scriptures do, seeing it is therein enjoined upon believers.

Methodist.—"But I know that I have not only *one* but *many things* to do yet; I must fight the good fight of faith; watch and pray; keep myself in the love of God; and grow daily in grace and holiness: I must go on to perfection. And I believe, when *I love God with all my heart*, and am sanctified wholly, I shall be much happier than I am at present."*

To this the Baptist is made to say, "How that may be, I can't tell." That is, I profess myself an *utter stranger* to those things you mention, viz. Fighting the

the good fight of faith, watching and praying, and seeking to love God with all my heart, &c.

Is it not evident that this author designs to insinuate that none of those christian principles and virtues find a habitation in the heart of a Baptist? To confirm which, his Anabaptist is made to say,—“ My heart is deceitful and desperately wicked—I am a poor sinner ; I commit sin every moment ; but my comfort is, I know I can’t fall from grace.” After he has thus put words in his mouth intending them to be understood as the sentiments of the whole community of Baptists, he then proceeds to pass sentence against him. “ Then I am sure you can’t go to heaven when you die.” The consequence is, we must go to hell ; for I suppose he will hardly grant us the privilege of purgatory.—Again, “ I doubt you are fallen from grace already.” Doubt ! dear sir, why need you doubt about the matter ? It is most certain, if what you say is true. And is this all the charity you have for us ? from such charity good Lord deliver us ! One would reasonably have hoped, that this gentleman who so frequently complains against us for our hard speeches against other denominations would have shunned the rock on which we are said to split. But when I hear him say, “ then I am sure you can’t go to heaven when you die,” I think he cannot have the face to complain again on this account. A sentence which plainly shews the spirit by which he was actuated, and the good will he has to us. What we believe and practice we are ready to own and vindicate when ever we are called upon. And it must be acknowledged by all who are acquainted with our principles and practice, and who can find a heart to speak the truth, that we do not tolerate any species of vice either in heart or life more than our neighbours. And as to a state of absolute perfection in the flesh, that is what we have not as yet attained to ; nor does the piece I am animadverting on, shew much of the perfection of its author. As for the odium he endeavours to cast upon the doctrine of the saints final perseverance in grace, I regard it not ; nor can he confute it. If he thinks

he can, I am willing to dispute that point with him whenever he pleases.—Yes, it is a comfort to know that I have a God in Christ to go to in all times of adversity and temptation; a God who hath said, *I will never leave thee nor forsake thee*, Heb. 13. 3. *And I will not turn away from them to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts that they shall not depart from me*, Jer. 32. 40. And I adore that most powerful Redeemer who, *having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end*, John 13. 1. *And for their comfort and establishment hath said, I give unto them eternal life and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hands*, John 10. 28. That there is *no condemnation to them*, Rom. 8. 1. and, *that they shall not come into condemnation*, John 5. 24. These and such like precious promises support the christian in his afflictions and trials, revive his hope, confirm his faith, and strengthen him to every good word and work; while the contrary principle, that is, that a man may be in a state of grace this hour and in a state of wrath the next; or a child of God to day and in hell to-morrow, saps the foundation of the assurance of faith, and cuts the very sinews of christian comfort. It keeps the person who believes it under a continual dread and slavish fear of hell, and, instead of procuring the compleat emancipation of the soul, keeps it in a state of vassalage under the law as a covenant of works; and if there be any comfort in the doctrine, I do not envy those who enjoy it.

The next thing to be taken notice of is the flat contradiction or at least the great inconsistency which he makes the Baptist guilty of. In page 1, he makes the Anabaptist assert that a compliance with baptism renders the believing soul more happy. “*But one thing now and all is well; and when that one thing is done you will be much happier than you are now.*” But he soon changes his note, for in p. 3, he is made to speak quite the contrary.

Methodist. “I ask in my turn, with all christian gravity, what good your adult dipping has done you?”
—To have made him consistent with himself, the answer

swer ought to have been, "I am much happier now than I was before I was baptized." But instead of that he puts words in his mouth, (for he does not find them in the dialogue) and makes him flatly contradict himself in order that he may take the advantage of him. Nay, says he, " I dont say it has done me any good."—That his design was to blind and deceive the simple, is obvious to every discerning eye : for I would ask him how he could have the vanity to believe that any man of sense and reason would look upon these words as a proper answer to be given by a Baptist disputant ? What ! no good at all, in no respect whatever ? why then is it plead for ? it ought to be given up from that consideration.—But with his leave, I am ready to answer to his questions on this subject.

If it be asked, what good there is in believers baptism ? or what advantage we receive from it ? I answer, much every way.

1. It is the fulfilling of righteousness, if Christ's own words are to be admitted as a proof, *Mat. 3. 13.* *Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* That baptism is the thing spoken of, is evident from the context. That it becomes us to fulfil it; and that a submission to this ordinance is the fulfilling of righteousness the blessed Jesus himself declares ; *suffer it to be so now.* For what reason ? *for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.* Indeed this author calls it the counsel of Satan, * and so sets himself against its divine author. Christ calls it a righteous work, a comely thing. He verily believes it (he says) *to be a counsel of Satan.* It appears he was a little doubtful, such a malicious, I had almost said blasphemous, assertion, would be suspected to spring from an evil source, and therefore he ushers it in with a faintly air, "*I speak it in the fear of the Lord,*" which was craftily done ; for if he had not told his readers so, they would have been apt to have concluded he had not the *fear of God before his eyes.*

If it be said that Infant Sprinkling is a fulfilling of righteousness, the silence of the scriptures which have

nowhere enjoined or even mentioned it, evinces the contrary; besides baptism is a work, and those who fulfil it must be active in the performance of it, Acts 22. 16. *Now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized.*—But infants do neither consent nor submit to it; nay they are insensible of and averse to it; therefore it cannot be said with the least propriety they fulfil it. Neither do parents obey God in having it done, seeing God has nowhere enjoined it upon them. If he has, we should be glad to see the place where such a command is given: but God has given no such command, therefore we have no right nor should we do any such work in his name. Yea, so far is this human invention from fulfilling this divine ordinance, that it is a notorious deviation from and violation of it.

Seeing then that baptism is a work, a righteous work, believers only can fulfil it; they only cheerfully embrace and freely submit in obedience to him who hath said, *thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.*

2. Baptism when rightly performed is obedience to an express command of God.

1st. God has commissioned his ministers to administer it to the proper subjects, Mat. 28. 18.

2d. He has commanded believers to submit to it, Acts 22. 16. *Why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized.* The true Convert is to obey Christ in both soul and body which are his. Then why tarriest thou, believer? for what he said to Paul he says to all, *Arise and be baptized.* Again, those who have received the Holy Ghost are expressly commanded to be baptized, Acts 10. 47. 48. *Can any man forbid water that those should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.* If there were no other text in the Bible relative to baptism this would be sufficient to satisfy the mind of every unprejudiced person, that believers are the only proper subjects: for that here is an express command for water baptism cannot be denied: and that it extends to none but those who had received the Spirit of God is plain. Nor is there one word said about their infants, which
had

had they been baptized would have been as easy as necessary on this occasion, seeing it was the first sermon preached among the Gentiles, and the first time baptism was administered to them. He commanded them, and them only to be baptized who had received the Holy Ghost; which command is equally binding now on all persons so qualified.—And the receiving of the Divine Spirit is so far from being an argument against our being baptized with water, that it is the only thing that qualifies a person for a worthy receiving of it. Believers then who submit to the will of God in this ordinance fulfil his positive and plain command; in the keeping of which there is great happiness and reward, John 13. 17. Psa. 19. 11.

3. A third benefit arising from baptism is, the answer of a good conscience towards God, of which infants are incapable; but believers can and do, according to that in 1 Pet. 3. 21. *The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us; not the washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God.* That this text militates much against infant baptism, and makes in favour of us, is evident; for no infant can be a subject of the qualification required. *A good conscience* implies an heart sprinkled from an evil one, and shews the necessity of regeneration as a prerequisite to baptism. The *answer* towards God, or to God, intends the inward witness of being willing to obey God in all things, Heb. 13. 18. For the truth of which they can apply to Omniscience itself, “*Lord thou knowest all things, thou knowest that I love thee.*”—Of such it may be said, that they have *a conscience void of offence towards God and man*, Acts 24. 16. *And shall not be ashamed, for they have respect unto all his commands*, Psa. 119. 6.—This is such an answer as is made by a believing heart, and not by god-fathers and god-mothers in behalf of the infant, which this author supposes to be the meaning of the apostle; * tho’ I dare say these *odd fathers* and *odd-mothers*, for so they may more properly be called, were utterly unknown to *him*, being of a much later date:

B

but

but this author says, and who dare dispute his *say so*, that sponfers were in use at the circumcision of infants among the Jews; † but doubtless if they were it must be among the *traditionistical* Jews, who broke over the hedge made in Dut. 12. 32. “What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto nor diminish from it.” It is really curious to see how the *cousins* and *relations* of *Elizabeth* are by his working fancy metamorphosed into *sponfers* and *sureties*, because they had a little *customary chat* about the name of the child, and marvelled when they found how heaven itself had interfered in the matter. And it is truly marvellous, that he who makes so little of John’s baptism, should make so much of his guess-work conjectures about the circumstances of his circumcision as to be for “retaining them as right and good,” and to make them the main prop to support a tottering cause!

4. Another advantage arising from baptism is, that believers have the satisfaction to know that they justify God in submitting to it, Luke. 7. 29. *And all the people and publicans justified God being baptized.* They justified, that is, they commended, or approved of the will of God, in appointing such an ordinance; they testified their love to it by embracing of it as a revelation of his wisdom; and thus believers justify God, that is, own his love and approve of the ordinance, as it lead them by faith to the Messiah; the glory of his love; the greatness of his sufferings; the attonement of his death; the conquest of his grave; the triumphs of his resurrection; their union with him; and their enjoyment of him; Rom. 6. 3. 4. which cannot be done by, nor with the least propriety said of infants.

5. Believers by rendering a voluntary submission to this ordinance fulfil the counsel of God. And those who reject baptism are said to reject the counsel of God, Luke 7. 30. *And they rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized.* I do not read in all the book of God that any person was ever praised or blamed for embracing or rejecting infant baptism. But believers are praised for keeping the ordinances as they are delivered

unto them, 1 Cor. 11. 2. And those who embrace infant sprinkling and refuse scriptural baptism, reject God's counsel for their own tradition, for which they are to be blamed, Mark 7. 9. Paul tells us, Acts 20. 27, That he had not shunned to declare all the counsel of God ; and all the penmen of the scriptures were actuated by the same spirit ; so that if the sprinkling of infants be God's counsel, the scripture has somewhere declared it : but the scripture has nowhere declared it ; therefore it is not the counsel of God. God also has frequently owned baptism as his counsel in attending the ordinance in the manner we practice with his special blessing, not only to those who subject themselves thereto, but also to those who are spectators, who upon seeing it administered have been thereby convinced and brought to the knowledge of the truth ; so that if it were a counsel of satan (as this author presumptuously says) he would be like the foolish woman to pluck down his house with his own hands, which that subtle fiend is too politick to do.

6. Believers put on Christ in their baptism, Gal. 3. 27. *As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.* The putting on of Christ intends, the taking his cross, the making a public profession of his name, with a firm resolution to follow his example, and observe his instructions, thro' *good and evil report.* And this is done by every baptized believer in a very striking manner ; for there is not only a cheerful compliance with a part of the will of Jesus, which is despised and rejected by many, and an open declaration for Christ before men and angels ; but a personal humble engagement to obey him in all things, and bear a faithful testimony to his religion to their lives end. This profession and engagement are voluntarily made by the believer : *See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?* Acts 8. 36. But infants are incapable of making any such profession, and therefore do not put on Christ, which doubtless implies the actings of the mind.

7. Believers who make this publick profession of Christ,

Christ, lay themselves under strong obligations to die unto sin and live unto God, Rom. 6. 3, 4. *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father; even so we also should walk in newness of life.* Believers are dead to sin, dead to the law as a covenant of works, and dead to the flesh-pleasing ways of the world. They are made alive to God by faith in Christ; and are raised to walk in newness of life, and should be baptized by immersion to signify it; but all this loses its force and propriety when applied to infant sprinkling.

8. Another benefit which believers derive from Christ in their baptism is an increase of the influence and grace of the Spirit of God, which Christ has promised, Acts 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized every one of you for the remission of your sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* As if he had said, if you would prove to us, to yourselves, and to the brethren, the sincerity of your repentance, and the truth of your faith in and love to the Messiah, whom ye have crucified and slain; shew it by obeying his commands who hath sent us to *teach and baptize all nations*; and for your encouragement, ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. And in v. 41, 'tis said, *then they who gladly received his word were baptized.* And they continued steadfast in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers; which infants could not do. Besides, they were added to the church, which consists of spiritual materials, 1 Pet. 2. 5. *Ye as lively stones are built up a spiritual house.* A gospel church is God's building, his habitation and delight, and he increases all their gifts and graces while they are walking in obedience to his ordinances, Isa. 40. 31. James 4. 6.

9. Believers rejoice in a submission to baptism, and are comforted by it. The jailor believes and is baptized, and rejoices in God, Acts 16. 34. The Eunuch believes and is baptized, and goes on his way rejoicing, as baptized believers now do. They know these things

things and are happy in the doing of them, John 13. 17. And if you want to know whether baptism administers any consolation to an infant, only stand by the priest's elbow while he sprinkles the consecrated water in its face, and if it is not fast asleep I expect you will discover that it is affected with a very different sensation.

10. Believers prove and manifest their love to Christ when they submit to this ordinance, as well as when they obey the rest of his commandments, 1' John 5. 3. *This is the love of God that you keep his commandments*, John 14. 15. *If you love me keep my commandments*, v. 21. *He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me*. The truly regenerate love God in their hearts, and serve him in their lives. To them "Wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace."

Their language is, "Lord teach us thy ways and we will walk therein." Nothing of which can be said of or done by infants. They have not faith, therefore cannot please God, Heb. 11. 6. Upon the whole, how unscriptural and irrational then must infant baptism be.

I have been rather prolix in answering this question, because so many persons are desirous of knowing why we are so particular in requiring a subjection to this ordinance, according to Christ's example and appointment.

And now, if it be asked, "But what am I to go into the water for?" I answer, to obey the express command of God, and follow the example of Christ and the primitive christians: and if this *Methodist* wants to know what profit there is in believers baptism, or "what my baptism has done for me, that his has not done for him?" I have answered him.

He only pretends to have received one thing from his baptism. "*I have told you one thing already, I was thereby made a visible member of the church*;"*-- and would not have received this *one thing* but by a manifest *per-
version* of the institution. For my part I do not con-

ceive it to be an initiating ordinance : For altho' we hold that no person can be a regular member of a gospel church, or come with propriety to the Lord's Supper without baptism, yet he is not made a church member thereby : The mutual consent of both the church and the baptized person is necessary for that purpose, 2. Cor. 8. 5. Nor was it originally made use of for that end. If it were, into what *Church* was Paul initiated ? or the *Eunuch*, and others ? However, I ask, when were infants taken into the gospel church by baptism ? That *holy mother* did, very early, I shall not dispute ; but that Christ, or his *apostles* ever did, I utterly deny. And if this author thinks the contrary, let him answer the question fairly, and not twist and turn as he has done thro' this argument. I demand a *direct* answer. Tell us *when*, and *where*, infants were first baptized ; *whose* children they were, and the *name of the baptiser*. Mention the *chapter* and *verse*, and it sufficeth us. Until this be done, all he can say will be nothing to his purpose.

He says, " I have a great regard for the prayer book, and look into it very often." || Perhaps this is said more out of policy than good-will. I look into it too, and believe more of the doctrinal articles of it than he does, if he be a Methodist ; for it is well known that the doctrines are Calvinistical, † which by them are shot at from every quarter ; and when they have charged these doctrines upon christians of other denominations, then condemn them as devilish, and destructive to the soul who believes them ; fill their mouths with invectives and brand them with the most horrid epithets they are capable of. Yet they are *church-men*, and have a great regard for the church ! yet if one in their class should marry one out of it (altho' of the same church) he or she is turned out. Or if their *Brethren* should come to a class-meeting or love-feast, the doors are shut against them. Yet notwithstanding this, the preacher will get up, and in the face of the people declare they are all *brethren* and members of the *same church*.

church. And numbers are so ignorant of the church as not to discover this mean and *time-serving* policy.

The conduct of the Methodists towards the church often puts me in mind of that of *Joab*, with regard to *Abner*; while he embraced him with one hand and gave him a *kiss*, with the other he *stabed* him under the fifth rib.

It is very probable this professed member of the church of England becomes such a *stickler* for the Methodists, in hopes of promotion among them, as they will be apt to look upon him as their *superior*, he having that *Episcopal ordination* which they lack, in consequence of which he may have the dignity and influence of their *spiritual diocesan*, and perhaps he may have an eye to a *bishop's cap*, if they ever insist on *Ordination*, and it be supposed necessary.

He charges the author of the dialogues with condemning infants merely because he says "Mr. Baptismus admits none to baptism but those who are looked upon to be in a gracious state previous to their being baptized;" from whence he infers, from his practice in not baptizing infants, he looks upon them to be in a graceless state, and exposed to wrath eternal; and concludes he has brought him to such a pass as either to baptize infants or devote them to destruction.

But has not this author (to use his own words) either spoken evil of the things he does not understand, or wilfully misrepresented them? The point Scripturist was upon, was to prove that the Baptists are so far from condemning every person to hell, that are not baptized, that they conceive every one should be in a state of salvation previous to their baptism. This author's design, perhaps, in this paragraph, was to expose us for holding the scriptural doctrine of original Sin, and if so, he gives himself a blow on the face; for he himself holds, "we are by nature born in sin, and children of wrath;" and that every person born into this world deserves God's wrath and damnation," if he continues his *unfeigned* assent and consent to all things contained in the prayer book;

book ; and does not wish any *passages* in it were *otherwise*. And I imagine, we may believe, that infants are not by nature in a gracious state, but in a sinful one, and yet have *charity* enough with *Scripturist* to hope that all infants dying in infancy are saved thro' the merits of *Christ*, whether baptized or not. P. 32.

He proceeds § to justify the church, in saying children are regenerated by baptism, and mentions two texts, viz. John. 3. 5. and Tit. 3. 5. for that purpose ; texts which many sober divines, of his own denomination, think have no respect to baptism at all ; or at farthest, only by way of allusion. At first, indeed, he distinguishes between "*born of water*" and "*born of the spirit,*" and makes the *former* "*but the outward and visible sign*" while the *latter* is "*the inward and spiritual grace.*" But when pinched with a quotation from the *baptismal office*, where God is thanked that it hath pleased him, to *regenerate the infant with his holy Spirit*, he very gravely informs us, that *regeneration by water*, is *regeneration by the Spirit* ; in the same manner as a gentleman says, "*I have ploughed my ground and laid by my corn ;*" when it is evident he means no more than that his *servants* had done it by his direction. Well done good and faithful *servant baptism*, through thy means it seems we are *born of the Spirit* ! but where goes the distinction of baptismal and spiritual regeneration ? This author by an uncommon *manœuver* has thrown it into "*the dirt,*" where we shall leave him to "*rake*" after it.

In p. 9, he misquotes a passage from the dialogues, making the author say that *every minister who declares, &c. That is, every Episcopal clergyman must stretch his conscience, or in plain English, be forsworn.* So then, according to this gentleman's plain english, to *declare* and *swear* is the same thing ; as in p. 49, to lie in bed when sorely beaten and abused, and call for a cordial, (see dial. p. 15,) in *plain english* is, to be so *drunk* as not to be able to rise. Doubtless he must be a person of a wonderful sagacity when such things, as would escape the discovery of all others, appear so *plain* to him.

But

But to the point : The author of the dialogues only says, and he says truly, that *these* must stretch their conscience who, while they wish several things in the service-book were otherwise, nevertheless declare their unfeigned assent and consent to all things contained in it. However, this rubs closely, and the Methodist gets in a rage, and says to the Anabaptist, “ Does your author think that illiberal abuse and uncharitable censures will make in favour of his cause ? ” and then falls to it himself with all his force, in which I must acknowledge he gets the victory. But in order to compleat his design, after he has charged the Baptists with being guilty of many enormous offences, he makes him say, “ well, well, dont say any thing about that.” Upon which he lets drive a second time—“ Its no wonder you are for hushing up and passing over slightly the most notorious offences, seeing that is one of your tenets—you may fall foully, but not finally.” And then asks, “ To what lengths of sin may not men be encouraged to go, by such a licentious principle as this ? ”

As to our hushing up and passing by the most notorious offences, I must beg his pardon while I tell him it is notoriously false : And as to the doctrine of the saints final perseverance in grace, I shall not stand to debate that point with him here. And as to his question, “ to what length of sin, &c.” I shall leave that for him and his Brother at Dover to answer ; while I ask them, to what length of sin they ran to when they held the Calvinistical principles ? For, if I am not mistaken, they were both designed for ministers of another order ; and what it was that prevented their ordination among them, and converted them to *Episcopalians*, I shall not say. Or to what length of sin did the rector of Bath parish run, when he was preaching (I would rather say reading) to numerous and admiring auditories, sermons which were composed by *Predestinarian divines* ? surely he did not hold with the Arminian tenets then ; neither did he think the doctrine of free and sovereign grace led to licentiousness.

A charge of the same nature we have in p. 14, where he makes the Anabaptist say, he should think he committed

mitted a very great sin to stand for a child. In terms of *ill placed satire* he exclaims "commit a very great sin! and what of that? Sin cannot hurt you. A grievous fall would only make you more humble; and your brethren would only like you the better for it. This if I mistake not is agreeable to your doctrine."—Rather thus, if I mistake not, is a direct violation of that command, "*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour,*" which I should suppose would be a *very great sin* even in a *Methodist*. But perhaps he thought, as it was against the Baptist, his *Brethren* would like him the better for *that*.

I want to know, says the Baptist, if you have any proof for infant baptism?—A great deal more than you have against it, (says the Methodist.*)—And what pity it is that out of a great deal we could not get a little; but are referred to the *traditions* of the fathers; in support of which he quotes 2 Thes. 2. 15. *Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle.* Then it follows, says this author, "that if infant baptism is *only* handed down to us by *tradition*, we must hold it fast, &c."—But stop: The apostle does not command us to hold fast the *traditions of the church of Rome*; but those which we have been taught by the *words or epistles* of himself and the other inspired penmen. Mark the words; *by our epistle*. Now if the apostles have taught infant baptism in any of their *words or epistles*, I have never yet seen it, though *I have read my Bible through since I came from school*; † and I am satisfied it is not to be found there: And if this gentleman is possessed of any well authenticated *oral traditions*, or unwritten words of the *apostles*, and infant baptism among them, I should be glad to see them; and if my conduct is to be regulated thereby, to get them printed and fastened into my Bible. Indeed if he will make a voyage to *Rome* he may be furnished with a goodly number, and those too of *ancient date*, which will take in not only his favourite infant sprinkling, but also *crossings, holy water, praying for the dead, reliques, sufflation, trine-*
immersion,

immersion, exorcism, chrism, white-garments, milk and honey, to the new baptized, &c. &c. (see dial. p. 8.) which have the countenance of antiquity, as well as infant baptism; (see Delaune's plea.)

“ For infant baptism, says he, † we have the practice of all the *primitive churches* on our side, and the concurrent testimonies of many ancient *fathers and councils.*” This I positively deny; and shall proceed to evince and demonstrate the contrary; and that there is not one *truly primitive church* on his side.

1. The first truly primitive church was that at *Jerusalem*, which consisted of such as were made the disciples of Christ and baptized. First made the disciples of Christ and then baptized by his apostles, (for Jesus himself baptized not) John 4. 1, 2. This church afterwards greatly increased; three thousand persons, who were pricked to the heart under Peter's ministry, were commanded by him *to repent and be baptized*, Acts 2. 38, And upon their *gladly receiving the word*, of salvation by Christ, were added to it, v. 41; and continued steadfast in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, v. 42: which proves them to be adult persons; nor do we read of any one infant being baptized while this truly primitive church subsisted.

2. The second primitive church we read of was that at *Samaria*; for that there was a church there is evident from Acts 9. 31, which seems to have been planted by the ministry of Philip; the original members of which were *men and women*, who were baptized after they *believed the gospel preached by Philip*, Acts 8. 12: *After they believed, Philip preached the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women.* Had it been customary for the apostles to have baptized infants, here would have been a very proper place to have mentioned it; seeing they were so particular as to say *men and women*: But so far was this church from practising infant sprinkling, that she does not even countenance it. Nor is there the least intimation given of it in any thing that is said relative to this truly primitive church.

3. The third church recorded, is that at *Cesarea*, of whose baptism we have a particular account, *Acts* 10. 47. 48. After Peter had preached Jesus Christ to them, *and the Holy Ghost had fallen upon them who heard the word*, they were then commanded by him to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Here you may observe that there was a *hearing of the word*; a *receiving of the Holy Ghost*, and a *positive command*, before baptism. Learn, farther, that our receiving of the Spirit of God is so far from being an argument against our being baptized with water, that it is the principal thing which qualifies us for it, and furnishes out an argument why we ought to do it. So no infant baptism here.

4. The fourth church was that at *Philippi*, (which was the chief city of that part of Macedonia) the foundation of which seems to have been laid in the two families of Lydia and the goaler. And that there were no infants in this church, see what the apostle says to them, *Phil.* 1. 1. *Saints in Christ Jesus*; who were made so by *the good work* God had begun in them, v. 6; who *abound in love*, v. 9; who prayed for the apostle, v. 19. Nothing of which can be said of infants. And whether there were any children baptized in these two families, I shall hereafter consider: So that it does not appear infant baptism obtained in this church: and indeed I despair of finding it in one New Testament primitive church. However, fortune favours the brave; we will therefore continue our search as far as we have *scripture ground* to tread on, that we may find it if it is to be found.

5. Our next search shall be in the church at *Corinth*, of which it is said, *1 Cor.* 11. 2. *That they had kept the ordinances as they were delivered to them*. And who these were that had kept the ordinances of the Lord, Paul himself tells you, *1 Cor.* 1. 2. *The church of God sanctified in Christ Jesus—called to be saints*. And how these Corinthians came to be manifestly sanctified and to be saints, we are told *Acts* 18. 8. *And Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized*.

baptized. These Paul calls the church of God; the saints at Corinth. And he tells us he himself baptized *Crispus* and *Gaius*, and the *household of Stephanus*, which were the first fruits of the gospel in Achaia, and that they addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints, 1 Cor. 16. 15. But no tidings of infant baptism yet: For the Corinthians *heard* and *believed* before they were baptized.

6. The next church we have an account of is the church of *Ephesus*, which seems to have originated from those twelve men we read of in the 19th of Acts, who *believed*. Nor have we any hint of any infant being ever received into it.

7. The church of Rome, whose faith was *spoken of throughout the whole world*, Rom. 1. 8, these, before they were baptized were made dead to sin, Rom. 6. 2; and then to represent it, were *buried* by baptism, v. 4.

8. I have also considered the church at *Colosse*, and find, that after they had been circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off, in the work of regeneration, the body of sin—it is then added—*buried with him in baptism*, Col. 2. 11. 12.

I have likewise made diligent search throughout *Galatia* and *Theffalonica*, the seven Churches that were in Asia, together with *Judea* and *Jerusalem*, and the region round about *Enon* and *Jordon*, and can find no person that ever heard of infant baptism in *that age* of the world; from whence I conclude that it is of a more recent original. This author is, therefore, so far from having the primitive churches on his side, that there is not one that speaks for him; but all with united voice cry out “*Infant baptism is not here.*”

But it seems he has “The concurrent testimonies of ancient councils,” &c. what councils these were he has not told us, and I am certain that it is not countenanced by any council of the apostles and primitive christians. For,

1. We read of a council, Acts 1. 15, which consisted of one hundred and twenty disciples: I have read over
C *their*

their proceedings, but can find no *act* made for, nor any thing said about, infant baptism.

2. Another we have an account of *Act* 2. 1; where they (the apostles and disciples of Christ) all came together with one accord in one place. I have particularly considered the business of that day, and can find no mention made of infant baptism: but I understand from the most authentick records, that a *principal speaker* in the house made this proclamation, “*Repent and be baptized every one of you;*” which sounds much like the voice of a Baptist. From which I conclude, that this *Council* was of our opinion, and not his.

3. A third and honourable council was held at Jerusalem, *Acts*. 15. 6; Where it is said the apostles and elders came together to consider some matters of importance, one of which was Circumcision, a very fit and proper time and place to have declared it if, (as some say) baptism was to succeed in the room of circumcision; but instead of that, not one single sentence is said about it. So that in all the *epistles*, *preachings* and *councils* of the apostles, there is not the least account of infant baptism.

And had we not then much better abide by what those more ancient fathers, Peter, Paul, James, John, Jude, &c. have left upon record? But this, he says, is speaking contemptibly of the ancient fathers, and rejecting their authority, (P. 11.) What, because we prefer *Peter*, *Paul*, &c. before them! I imagine we have not much to fear from the sentence of a protestant jury; as it would be easy to produce twice twelve divines who have given it as their sentiment, that the scripture is our *only* rule, and a *sufficient* one. According to this author, if we reject the authority of these *fathers*, we must reject *Peter*, *Paul*, &c. * why so? because as far down as 330 years after our Lord’s ascension “they determined what books were to be accounted canonical, as being the composition of the apostles.” But I hope we may grant them equal to that task, and put great confidence in their *care* and *fidelity*,

lity, without putting them upon a level with the inspired penmen, as he seems to do, when he tells us, if he did not think the authority of these fathers was to be depended upon, he must reject Peter, Paul, &c.

He says it is ridiculous in the author of the dialogues to say that error is never to be the more respected for having a grey head. † Pray how is this ridiculous? Why is ancient error to be more respected than modern? does Origen's grey head make his ridiculous interpretation of Matt. 19. 12. or his doctrine of a general jail-delivery from hell, more respectable? Or why may he not take Augustine's and other of the fathers word for the damnation of unbaptized infants, as well as for the baptizing them? especially since Dr. Wall shews that it was their general opinion that baptism was necessary to salvation; (see Wall's Hist. of in. bap.) But "how ridiculous is it, says he, when he is indebted to these very grey heads for all the knowledge he has of Peter, Paul, &c. and of their writings." * I thought we were indebted to Luke for some knowledge of them, who has given us the only acts of the apostles, that can be depended on, as is generally confessed. And I believe we are principally indebted to the watchful Providence of God, which has preserved their writings, both before the times of these fathers as well as in later ages when the darkness of Popery spread itself over the christian world.

I shall be excused for subjoining a pertinent remark of the celebrated Dr. Watts. || " Shall we judge of matters of the christian faith by the fathers or primitive writers for three or four hundred years after Christ? But they often contradicted one another, and themselves too; and what is worse, they sometimes contradicted the scripture itself. Now in all these different and contrary sentiments in religion, which of the ancients must we believe; for we cannot believe them all?"

He asks, † may not a thing be actually proved by tradition? I answer, doubtless it may. Yet he makes his Anabaptist say there can be no proof from that. Here and

and in several other places, he insinuates, that we will believe *nothing* but what is in the scripture. At this rate, we must look upon all *historical relations* to be *false* or at least *incredible*;—but this is a *slander* of his own and no *principle* of ours. Well, but “if a thing can be proved by *tradition*, can you desire any other proof?”† *This strikes wide*. We may certainly pay a proper regard to *human testimony*, without making it in whole or in part the *rule* of our faith and practice in *matters of religion*. Such *scripturists*, and such only, we desire to be.

And now after a long *traditional excursion* we are brought to the *scriptures* again. He assures us, § *Peter, Paul, &c.* are the very men he will abide by; and seems willing to give it up, if they have left any thing upon record against infant baptism. The *Baptists* are ready to acknowledge they can find nothing upon record against it, and that for a very obvious reason, because there is nothing left upon record about it. In this respect it is on a footing with a deal of other *Romish trumpery*, that the *apostles* were utter strangers to. But he agrees to quit his *Papistical strong hold*, and promises to retract “if his practice be not countenanced by them, and by *Jesus Christ* the father of the christian church.” On this ground then we are ready to meet him, and promise, in our turn, that if he can prove that *Jesus Christ* or his apostles ever practised or required it, we will give up the point. But does he prove this? No he immediately *flies the way* and does not so much as attempt it.

In p. 15. he blames *Scripturist* for, what he calls, a misquotation, “If God-fathers, &c. absolutely promised that the child shall renounce the devil, &c. it would be very absurd indeed.” Well, however absurd it may be, they are guilty of it, if there be any *sense* in the churches calling them *sureties*, or any *truth* in what the child is taught to say, viz. “They did promise and vow three things in my name, first, that I should renounce the devil, &c.” what then are we to think of this

this gentleman's denial of this ? " You know they do not, they cannot promise *any such thing*." Why, by a pedantic parade of a few *grammatical terms* he undertakes to fetch off both himself and the sureties very handily. " The word, says he, is *should* of the potential or subjunctive mood, which implies a contingency." If this contingency is to be applied to these what-d'-ye-call-em's, (for it seems we are not to denominate them *promises*) one would imagine *may* or *might* would have been used, if it was---as he says, they only express the duty of the children, I do not see how *duty* is a contingency---besides, in that case, *must* or *ought* would probably have been used.—But to set this gentleman right, as *should* is the preter tense of the auxiliary *shall*, it was impossible for the children to relate the affair as a past transaction, and not make false concord, without using *should* ; however absolute the promises were. A similar instance or two will make it plain. When the apostle Paul, Acts 26. 22, 23. speaks of those things which the prophets and Moses did say *should* come, that Christ *should* suffer, and that he *should* be the first that *should* rise from the dead, and *should* shew light to the Gentiles," are all these important *should's* so in the potential or subjunctive mood as to imply a contingency ? Or, in the time of the late establishment, when the vestry in the name of the inhabitants of Bath parish received the rector thereof as their *spiritual guide*, had the question been put to that Revd. gentleman, " what did the vestry *promise* you at your induction ?" would it not have been a proper reply, " they did promise that I should receive 16000lb. of tobacco as thereward of my ministerial labours, besides the other perquisites. Now if any person who professed to be learned in law had (on such a supposition) undertaken to *clear* the vestry from any absolute engagement, by saying, " If they promised you *shall* receive, &c. it would be very absurd indeed ; but you know they did not ; they cannot *promise* any such thing ; the word is *should* in the potential or subjunctive mood, and implies a contingency ;"

cy:" perhaps it would have made him acquainted with a mood different from either of these.

Let us now see whether his logic will speed better than his grammar. *Scripturist's* argument, to prove that *Christ* and his *apostles* were all *Baptists*, is said by this expert logician to be a *sophism* of that kind which the learned call *Ignoratio Elenchi*, or a mistake of the question ||. Pray how has he *mistaken* the question? "Why, says he, the question in debate is not whether the apostles and primitive christians were baptized, or whether they did baptize, but whether they were *for* or *against* the baptizing of infants." Now, it will be evident to any person who will see with his own eyes, and not judge of *Scripturist's* arguments by the mutilated quotations made by this writer, that the question is so far from being mistaken, that it is expressly put in *Traditionist's* mouth, and *Scripturist* gives it a direct answer, by observing what the scriptures say concerning John's baptizing our Saviour and the multitudes; from whence he infers that his *manner* of baptizing was much *more similar* to our practice than to theirs who practise *baby sprinkling*. If this be not a very *pretty* argument, it is a tolerable *convincing* one; so he may keep *Ignoratio Elenchi* to himself, and we shall see that he takes frequent occasion to make use of it in this controversy.

He next gives us a taste of his skill in a mess of chopt logic. "By chopping logic after the manner of your author, I could as well prove that a man is a goose, an ass, or any creature you please." For my part I should not be pleased at all to see my own species undergo the brutal transformation; but though I am inclined to think it impossible to *demonstrate* by any argument that a man is a brute of any kind, yet I confess I have heard that there is a manner of arguing that will *denominate* a man a *goose* or an *ass*; and I wonder this author was not afraid to mention the names of those animals in particular, lest some man of a penetrating judgment should take occasion from his manner of reasoning to rank him among them.

John's

John's baptism both with regard to the subjects and mode, is such an insuperable difficulty in his way, that he not only protests against being *John's* disciple, * which nobody has perswaded him to, but boldly pronounces his baptism invalid, † and declares that his baptism and the christian baptism is not the same. § Whereas *John's* baptism was from heaven ;—he was sent to prepare the way of the Lord—He required repentance, and faith in Christ as prerequisites—and when the risen Jesus gave his apostles a commission to teach and baptize, we have no account of any alteration with reference to the subjects or mode—all which conspire to prove that *John's* baptism, and that administered by the apostles, were essentially the same. Add to this what *Mr. Pool* observes ; (Annotations on the place :) “ Unless *John's* baptism and the apostles were the same, *Christ* and his members (the church) are not baptized with the same baptism.” But this author supposes he has positive scripture proof to the contrary. Let us attend to it. “ In the 19th of Acts we read of some who had been baptized with *John's* baptism—but this would not do—*John's* baptism was not looked upon to be *valid*, and therefore baptism was repeated on those certain disciples which the apostle found at Ephesus.”

Now all the difficulty in this passage, by which he supposes, no doubt, he has sufficiently puzzled us, arises from imagining those twelve men were *rebaptized* by the order of *Paul*; whereas, if we consider the 5th verse as a continuation of *Paul's* speech, and not the words of *Luke* the historian, the difficulty vanishes: *Paul* asks these men, who had not heard of the extraordinary gifts of the spirit, “ Into what were ye baptized?” they answer, “ Into *John's* baptism;” upon which he declares his hearty acquiescence therein; “ *John* verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him who should come after him, that is, on *Christ Jesus*; when they heard this, proceeds the apostle, speaking still to the twelve men, when

when the *Jews* heard this from the mouth of *John*, they were baptized in the name of the Lord *Jesus*. After which *Luke* informs us, that *Paul* laid his hands on them, i. e. as baptized persons, that the gifts of the *spirit* might be imparted to them. This author doubtless is not ignorant that this is agreeable to the exposition of *Beza*, *Pool*, and divers other learned *Pedobaptists*.

Let us now see how we can sustain his attack upon his own ground, by supposing those twelve men were baptized over again by *Paul's* order. Upon that supposition, it does not appear they were baptized again, because *John's* baptism was *invalid*, as he asserts; but because it was not properly administered. Unto what were ye baptized? says *Paul*. They reply, unto *John's* baptism, "that is, as I take it, (says *Mr. Henry* on the place) "They were baptized in the name of *John*; "not by *John* himself, he was far enough from any "such thing; but by some weak well-meaning disciple of his, that ignorantly kept up his name as they "head of a party, retaining the spirit and notion of "those disciples of his, that were jealous of the growth "of *Christ's* interest, and complained to him of it. *John* 3. 26."

To manifest the impropriety of such a conduct, *Paul* said unto them, *John* verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him that should come after him, that is on *Christ Jesus*. That is, he was so far from baptizing in his own name, that he required faith in, and baptized them unto, the *Messiah*. When they heard this, being conscious they had not been thus baptized: They were baptized in the name of the Lord *Jesus*.

Upon either of these expositions, we see how little reason this author had to propose his vaunting question, *Have I not proved my assertion?* * as there is a manifest agreement between *John's* baptism and that administered by the *apostles*, and it appears they are for substance the same.

It may be proper to observe here, that taking this passage in the latter sense, it teaches us this important lesson, viz, That where there is a principal *defect* in the administration of baptism, it must be *repeated*; which applies strongly to infant sprinkling, which is a manifest perversion of the subjects and mode. And if it be said the cases are not similar, because baptism is administered to infants in the name of the Trinity. I answer, it is so much the worse, because it is a *taking the name of the Lord in vain*. The Baptists therefore have sufficient warrant for baptizing such *over again*.

I cannot easily conceive the ground of this gentleman's violent *antipathy* to *John*, unless it be that he sees his baptism corresponds so little with his own antiscip-tural practice. Though to colour it over, he raises an outcry against the *validity* of that baptism which *Christ* the great head of the church condescended to submit to. Well, one would think he was very staunch for *Christian baptism* in distinction from, yea in opposition to *Jewish baptism*; but the tide soon turns, and he suggests that the apostles having received a general commission from our Saviour to baptize, were to regulate their conduct in reference thereto, by the Jewish custom of baptizing proselytes; concerning which he twice says, "It cannot be denied that it was a custom for them to baptize the infant children of Proselytes."

* But it *can* be denied, and *has been* denied by many learned Pedo-baptists, and has been unanswerably confuted by *Dr. Gill*, in a dissertation on the subject. And had such a custom prevailed among the Jews, how came their rulers to say to John, "*why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet,*" *John* 1. 25. But why does he say it can't be denied that it was a custom, &c. does he not know it behooved him to say, "it cannot be denied that God required the Jews, &c." Could he demonstrate ever so clearly that there was such a custom, I defy him, or any other person to shew the place in the word of God, where he required the Jews under that oecconomy to baptize.

tize *Profelytes* or *their children*. Now had it prevailed as a custom without the sanction of divine authority, it must have been no more than a *tradition of the elders*, which our Saviour was so far from countenancing, that he declares, concerning the *Jews* and their *traditions*, “In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,” Mark. 7. 7. Now how can this writer suppose the apostles would shape their practice by what our Saviour so severely condemns, rather than by John’s baptism, which he himself confirmed and graced by his own glorious example?—this is building infant baptism on a *bog* indeed!

It has been alledged that infant baptism is a Popish invention. No, says this author, it is an old Jewish custom continued. And how has he mended the matter? For my part I should think it as *christian* a baptism if received from the *council of Carthage*, as from a *corrupted Sanhedrim*. But if the Jews baptized their profelytes, they afterwards received a more *valid* and *christian* baptism, as in the case of the *Eunuch*, who was no doubt a profelyte, yet notwithstanding proposed baptism to *Philip*, and was baptized by him, for ought appears, in the very manner we practice; and we shall esteem it our duty to Pursue the same method, with regard to those who have from tradition been sprinkled in their infancy.

He says,† “He knows of no end our baptism answers but to introduce envy, strife, contentions; bitterness, clamour and dissension.”—A *Romish priest* might have used the same argument against the *reformation*. And had the reformers bought *peace* at the expense of *truth*, they might have rested where they were. If our holding the truth, and vindicating it, be the occasion of exciting these evil dispositions in the hearts of those who are enemies to it, we are by no means the culpable cause, and rather than recede, we chuse that the strife should continue.

From

From what follows,* it is evident that his design is to represent us in the most horrid light that his *envy* and *bitterness* could suggest. The truth having deserted him, he calls in slander to his assistance.—“ But by what we can gather from the temper and spirit of the Anabaptists, we have too much reason to fear, if ever they get strong enough, we shall see a *sword* and feel it too.”—That is, we should fall upon them and murder them. This might have been taken for an *unchristian* *censure*, if it had not dropt from the pen of a person professing *perfection*. Human establishments, which the Pseudo-Baptists are very fond of, is what we abominate, and have borne open testimony against, even when we have had it in our power to establish our religion; as in *Rhode-Island Government*. He knows it is contrary to our principles and practice to endeavour to force men into our societies by the *sword* or *bayonet*, or to *enlighten* their minds by immuring them in the *dark walls* of a prison. Besides, if we were aiming to get strong enough, by being superior in numbers, to compass the diabolical design he charges us with, our constant conduct would manifest our folly; as it would be quite inconsistent with our interest, to *refuse* any who should propose to join our community, especially if they were able to bear Arms. It is, however very natural to judge others by ourselves; and I need not inform him what *denomination* of christians that was, that a few years ago imprisoned the *Baptists*; and who often made them see their *swords*, and sometimes feel the weight of their *whips*; the *man in black* sometimes heading the *mob* to see the work well done. This he knows is no *guess-work*. Yet all this is very well! we have nothing to fear from these *lamb-like, meek-hearted* creatures! The *Anabaptists only are to be feared!*

Well, the Baptists are not yet strong enough to conquer the infant sprinklers by the *carnal weapon*, if they were wicked enough to attempt it; yet notwithstanding their superior numbers, and human advantages, we are determined, with the *sword of the spirit* in our hands, never

ver to desert the cause of sacred truth, or shun the polemic warfare. Our numbers, are numbers of scripture texts, in which we put great confidence!—"Methodist, That is easier said than proved. I said before, and will maintain it, that you have neither precept nor example for your practice."—*I said!*—O wonderful proof! who can stand before such masterly reasoning! *I the Rector of Bath, said*—I wonder all the Baptists in America are not convinced by it! *I said before, and I will maintain it.*—This *I*, it seems, is to do the Baptist's business. But I can assure him his bare *say-soes* and positive assertions will not be taken for absolute demonstrations, unless he prove his infallibility. But what makes much against him is, he cannot get *Christ* or any of his *apostles* to vouch for him. Nay, they abundantly testify the contrary; and that we have both precept and example, I have proved, and will prove.

First, We have the example of *Christ*, the great head of the church, who was *baptized of John in Jordan*, Mark 1. 9. And Jesus when he was baptized went up straight-way out of the water, Matthew 3. 18.

Again, We have the example of the apostles, who never baptized any until they professed faith in Christ. Thus runs the commission; "*Go teach all nations, baptizing them*, Matthew 28. 19. And that they always acted up to their commission, their constant practice shews. *Repent and be baptized every one of you*, Acts 2. 38. *Then they that gladly received his word were baptized*, v. 41. *But when they believed, Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, they were baptized both men and women*, Acts 8. 12. Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost? Acts 10. 47. *And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord*, v. 48. *And he said, see here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God. And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him*, Acts 8. 36, 37, 38. *And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized*, Acts

22. 16. Now let any one compare these scriptures with both our practices, in reference to baptism, and judge who comes nearest to the *primitive standard*. He takes a *speechless infant*, and *sprinkles* a few drops of water in its face, upon which it is so highly offended, that it is carried off screaming and crying!—We take the *professing believer* who voluntarily goes down into the water and is *buried* with Christ in baptism, upon which he goes on his way rejoicing. Yea, let any impartial person, upon this short review of the scripture account of the subjects and mode, say, whether a man must not have a front of brass, to fly in the face of so much plain scripture, and roundly assert that we have neither *precept nor example for our practice*?

And now, it seems, we are likely to have his plain scripture proof for infant sprinkling. The Anabaptist wishes he would shew him where infants were ever baptized. “*That, says the Methodist, is not hard to do.*”—Yet despairing to find it in the New Testament, (where christian baptism is only to be found) he goes back to Moses and produces a passage which was written upwards of 1000 years before christian baptism was ever known or heard of in the world.

* “*Look here, says he, in the 12th chapter of Exodus:—Ay, look here, all ye inhabitants of the earth, and be convinced! look here, all ye Anabaptists, and be confuted! six hundred thousand Israelites went out of Egypt on foot, besides children who could not go on foot—and they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea—Now here you can’t deny that infants were baptized; and they were baptized by sprinkling too, and that is more.*” Neither can he deny that their *flocks* and *herds* came out with them, and were all baptized at the same time and in the same manner. And now he has a proof for the baptizing his *goose*, or *ass*, or any other creature, especially when he adds that convincing argument, where is any thing left upon record against it.

He seems to imagine this cloud was full of water and that the Israelites were sprinkled by the water which

D

fell

fell from it. Now if they were caught in the rain, 'tis probable the mothers *covered* the tender babes to preserve them from the *falling shower*, instead of holding them out in it, and if so where is his infant baptism?

But how could it enter the brains of this writer to imagine this to be a rainy cloud, formed of watery particles exhaled, and floating in the air; when the scripture represents it as a miraculous cloud, in which the Lord went before them, Exodus 13. 21. to direct their marches, Num. 9. 17. It was a cloud for a covering by day, and was a fire by night to give them light; Psa. 105. 39. And as it was night when the Israelites made their passage, had they been sprinkled with falling drops from this *flaming cloud*, it would doubtless have been a *baptism of fire* with a witness.

It is granted the apostle by a figurative form of speech makes this passage bear an allusion to baptism; and we conceive the circumstances make greatly in our favour in respect of the mode; tho' we confess it is quite ridiculous to imagine they either *plunged themselves or one another in the cloud*, or that the sea must *overwhelm them in order to their immersion*. The fact is, the waters stood erect on each side *like walls*, and the cloud *hung over* them; so that being at the bottom of the sea, encompassed by the lofty waters and the suspended cloud, they were *baptized*, i. e. surrounded by and, as it were, immersed in the cloud and in the sea. It is observable, that they are not said to be baptized *simply* in the cloud or sea; but in the cloud *and* in the sea, which can consist only with the above interpretation: for upon the supposition of their being sprinkled, it should have been *by the cloud*, &c. For it seems this author does not suppose them to have been in the cloud; and to say they were sprinkled in the cloud and in the sea, carries its own confutation with it.

* *Ana.* But how will you prove that infants are to be baptized now?—" *Metbo. The onus probandi must always lie upon my shoulders.*"—why, in the name of common sense,

sense, if his *shoulders* were unequal to the *burden*, did he under take it ?—" But, I mean I am to prove every " thing and you nothing."—What does he want us to help him out at the *dead lift* ? Indeed he has reason to complain, for the Baptist has put as hard a task upon him as ever a poor *Israelite* had by the most severe task master in *Egypt*. However, he says, * "*The right of infants to the ordinance of baptism is so clear, that it is no hard matter to prove it.*"

Why then did he not give the proof and settle the controversy ?—But, see, it is at hand ! Do, reader, attend to it ! " But, I—." We have had so many of Mr. P's proofs already that I am quite tired of them. " But I insist".—What pity it is that he could not say *Peter* or *Paul* insists. But let us have it. " But I insist upon it that as they are in *possession* of their right, or what almost *nine tenths* of the church of *Christ* believe to be their right, it lies upon you to prove that their right is *not* good, before they can legally be turned out of possession." This *right* is the very point in dispute; and he offers no proof for it. " O yes ! *nine-tenths* of "*the church of Christ* believe it ;"—that is, all who believe infants have a right to baptism, believe they have a right to it ; their possession of baptism is therefore legal.—*Masterly reasoning !* O ye *Papists !* there is danger, it seems, of your being *legally dispossessed* of your scriptureless ceremonies, while you continue the majority in Christendom !

As for his having *nine tenths* on his side, I should not have disputed that point with him if he had said *nineteen-twentieths*. Numb'r is no proof of *right* in matters of religion. *Elijah* only remains a prophet of the Lord, when the prophets of *Bael* are 450 men. *The world wanders after the beast ;* and what is highly esteemed among men is often abomination with God. And instead of its lying upon us to prove that their right is *not* good & he should have produced *scripture record* for their right. Let him shew, if he can, any clause in the *last will and testament* of *Jesus Christ* the King of Zion, and Head of

of the church, where he has ordered the trustees of his will to admit any to baptism till they profess faith in him.

But they are in possession !—and though the old saying, *possession is eleven points of the law*, is extending the matter far enough in all conscience ; yet few before this gentleman, perhaps, ever thought of making it *all in all*.

The comparison he brings, † concerning cutting him out of a farm, that he can trace a right to no higher than his grand-father, is no doubt very *apropo* to infant baptism, but the application must be fatal to his cause ; for does he not know that if he can't produce the *records* of his country to prove his right, he may be legally turned out of possession ? Besides, by his way of reasoning from it, he might defraud his neighbour out of his plantation, or any other article of property he has, if first he has but strength enough to take *forcible possession* of it. Thus,—he takes his child and puts him in *possession* of his neighbour's plantation, and keeps him there for some time ; he and all his friends proclaim it abroad, that it is his son's right *because* he is in possession of it.—His neighbour produces the most ancient and authentick *records* to prove his title to be good, but this will not do ; he maintains the right of his child, by saying, *he is in possession of it*, and has been for some time, and *nine-tenths* of his friends say his title is good ; and unless his neighbour can produce some *act* which *expressly* says, his son shall *not* possess such a plantation, he has an undoubted right and title to it : And thus, by setting the man to prove a *negative*, he has cut him out of his *plantation*.

Having been some time in the wilderness, we are again led to the *red-sea*,* where we are told that “ *Moses* was a type of Christ, and that parents and their children were initiated into the religion of *Moses*, and put themselves and their little ones under his government and direction by baptism ;” And then says, † “ In this very *thing* the *likeness* between *Moses* and *Christ* principally

cipally consists."—But when or where did *Moses* take them under his government, and initiate them into his religion by baptism? this surely could not be their baptism, in the *red-sea*; for they were under the government and direction of *Moses* some time *before* they came there.

That the apostle, when he speaks of the Israelites being baptized unto *Moses* in the *cloud* and in the *sea*, alludes to baptism, I have granted; and that *Pedobaptists* and *Antipedobaptists* have frequently argued from it for their respective modes, is notorious from their controversial writings; but I believe this gentleman has the *honour* of being the *first* who ever brought it to determine the *subjects* of the ordinance; but with him it is a *very plain argument*. Yet, methinks, this very plain argument, as he fondly terms it, comes with a very ill grace from one who makes so little of *John's baptism*, and so positively denies its *validity*.

Did he not consider, that this baptism to *Moses*, upwards of one thousand years before, must be as *antiquated* and *invalid* as *John's*; and that, we could easily retort upon him, "*Thou's nothing to me, I am not Moses's disciple,*" and if I was, it would puzzle you to prove that he had any *commission* to baptize, or that *he* ever baptized any one; or that the ordinance of baptism was *then* instituted; or that the *Israelites* went down into the sea *on purpose* to get their children baptized. Yet with an air of self confidence he enquires *how Christ is like unto Moses*, according to Acts 3. 22, if children are not initiated into his religion; yea, he insinuates, that if *Christ* had excluded infants from baptism, the *Jews* would have had ground to have disowned, and rejected him as the *Messiah*. And having his head full of the idea of infants being both baptized unto *Moses* and unto *Christ*, he concludes by declaring, "In this very thing the *likeness* between *Christ* and *Moses* principally consists."*—Amazing! that infant baptism should constitute the *principal likeness* between *Moses* and *Christ*, and yet that every *Pedobaptist* commentator that I have consulted, (though some of them have hit on some very striking

liknesses) should be so blind to this *principal one*, as totally to *overlook* it. Upon the whole, his *main scripture* for infant sprinkling proves nothing of that for which he advanced it, and he is as far to seek as ever.

And now the engagement appears to be more close and severe! He drags the Anabaptist from his entrenchment, and gets a severe blow for his pains.---*Anabaptist*. "Well, don't the scriptures say, *repent and be baptized, believe and be baptized?* Now how can infants either *repent or believe?*"---*Methodist*. Fie upon it! you have broke my head sadly the first stroke.|| --"What! give the *first stroke* which is half the battle, and yet act only upon the defensive, and keep out of the way of his strokes!† It seems he is a bad marks-man and *overshoots himself*, yet he gives him a *broken head* and makes him cry *fie upon it!*"---By his own confession he is *sadly hurt* and *worse scared*. But it seems the *deadly wound* is quickly *healed*.

Well, upon a recovery from the stroke, one would reasonably expect a *direct answer* to the question; but instead of that he pitifully turns it off by a *sophistical conclusion*, which he fancies must be drawn from the *denial* of baptism to infants, because they have not the prerequisites of repentance and faith, viz. that devils will be saved, and infants damned, because *those believe*, and *these cannot repent*. But we are not at all affected by his false reasoning, because we know the declarations of the gospel are not addressed to infants who cannot understand them; or to devils whose angelical nature Christ never assumed. And if, because God saves infants without repentance, we must baptize them without it, the conclusion equally follows, that if God refuses to save a devil though he believes, we might also *refuse* to admit to baptism an unbaptized man or woman who believes also. But surely God never intended that his sovereign methods of dispensing his grace should be the rule to direct us in the administration of his ordinances. Besides, his conclusion as naturally follows from his principles as from ours. Does he ad-

mit

mit infants to the Lord's Supper? No. Well, what does he require of persons who come to the Lord's Supper?-- Answer, "To examine themselves whether they *repent* --- have a lively *faith*," &c. Now he knows the scriptures say, "He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. And again, *Except ye repent ye shall perish*. Thus stands the argument.--- *All that believe shall be saved: but the devils believe*, (Jam. 2. 19.) *therefore the devils shall be saved*. And with respect to infants, thus stands the argument. --- *All who do not repent and believe shall be damned*. Infants neither repent nor believe, (for want of which he will not admit them to the Lord's Supper) *therefore all infants shall be damned*. Nay, don't start! This conclusion as clearly follows from the premises as yours, Mr. Impartial Enquirer himself being judge." But though he had not particularly considered this before, I hope he will be ashamed of the absurdity of such an argument for the future."§

Says the Metho. † "If you would read your Bible, you would see that faith and repentance were as much required to circumcision as to baptism." I have read it all over and I am sure it is not in mine. I can find in no part of it where repentance and faith are required in order to circumcision. And as he has said it, I call upon him to prove it. We find no such prerequisites even in Abraham's numerous family, whose circumcision was doubtless exactly agreeable to the divine institution. It was God's positive command, not their faith in the God of Israel, that gave them a right. * Neither does the passage he quotes, Exo. 12. 48. make any thing for his purpose, seeing there is not a word said concerning repentance or faith, but only a command for the stranger who sojourned among them to have his males circumcised before they were to be admitted to the passover. And let him shew us God's command for baptizing infants, and we will no longer dispute their right.

We

We come next to the commission, Matt. 28. 19. Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them, &c. which he renders *Go proselyte or disciple all nations* baptizing them, &c. from whence he concludes they are to be made disciples by baptism. Now Scripturist having asserted that either way it comes to the same; because Jesus first *made* disciples and then *baptized* them, *John* 4. 1; and that it would be an *odd sort* of a disciple that should be made without teaching, (dial. p. 29.) This gentleman supposes he did not understand the meaning of the word *disciple*; and having been a schoolmaster, undertakes to give a definition of it. "I thought every body knew that a disciple is one who is put under the care of a master to be taught—every child sent to school is a disciple of the master to whom he is sent."—† "The school-master tries how many scholars he can get by soliciting parents to send their children to him,—and calls them his disciples the very hour they are brought into his school, though they do not know a letter in a book." I would be glad to know of this ingenious gentleman, when he was a tutor, how many of these *young disciples* of eight days, a month, or six months old, he had in his school? Had a woman brought her infant in her arms, and addressed him thus, "sir, I understand you have opened a school for the instruction of children; and as I am desirous to have my child taught and instructed, please to take it as a *disciple of yours*." Methinks, on that supposition, I see him struck with amazement, and at a loss to determine whether the woman is *compos mentis* or whether she designs to *mock* him! doubtless, he would have been ashamed to receive such a disciple into his school for the purpose of teaching it. Yet he is for crowding *such* into the church of Christ, to be taught the *sublime mysteries of the gospel*, as he would be ashamed to receive into a school to teach the *alphabet*.

The original word *matheteusate*,—according to Dr. Whitbey* and other learned men, signifies *to make proselytes*

† P. 25.

* MATHETEUEIEN here, is to preach the gospel to
all

lytes by teaching, and therefore is something distinct from baptism, and ought by no means to be confounded therewith.

That infants neither are, nor can be *Christ's disciples* or scholars, is evident from the discriminating characters he himself gives of them. If *ye continue in my word* then are ye my *disciples* indeed, John 8. 31. Whosoever doth not *bear his cross* and *come after me*, cannot be my *disciple*, Luke 14. 27. Whosoever he be of you that *forsaketh not all that he hath*, he cannot be my *disciple*, v. 31. They also *love one another*, John 13. 35. And *bear much fruit*, chap. 15. 8.

The true meaning of the commission appears therefore upon the very face of it. *Go teach or disciple all nations, baptizing them, &c. teaching them to observe all things, &c.* from which it is evident, those whom they were to baptize, were to be such as were capable of being taught both *before* and *after* baptism; which is so far from being a *vain tautology* or *senseless repetition*, as this author asserts, * (a fine complement to our learned translators!) that it secures both the truth and sense at the same time. But to understand it according to this author, that they were to be made disciples by baptism, is to make the Holy Ghost chargeable with a vain tautology indeed: for then it must mean, *Go baptize all nations, baptizing them, &c. What pretty sense is this?*

We

all "nations, and to engage them to believe it in order to their profession of that faith by baptism; as seems apparent (1.) from the parallel commission, Mark 16. 15. "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. (2.) From the scripture notion of a disciple, that being still the same as a believer.—I desire any one to tell me how the apostles could MATHETEUEIN, make a disciple of an Heathen, or unbelieving Jew, without being MATHETAI or teachers of them, or whether they were not sent to preach to them that could hear, &c."—Whitby's note on Matt. 28. 19. —————* P. 26.

We see then how little this text countenances infant baptism : especially when we consider that the command *to teach or make disciples* is equally extensive with the command to baptize them, and respects the very same persons. All nations are to be *taught* previously to their being baptized, and if he has the *art* of teaching the infants in them, he shall have the *honour* of baptizing them ; and as soon as he opens his *school*, I will persuade all the Baptists to send their *infants* to him that they may be taught and baptized.

But we are told, † that the apostles “ commissioned them out among the Heathens who never heard of Christ—therefore it was necessary they should be taught,” &c. But did it not first lead them among the *Jews* who were not Heathens ? and did they not require the same Qualifications from both Jews and Gentiles ? or was there the least difference made between any ? When *John* preached in the wilderness of Judea, he rejected all from his baptism who did not profess faith in the Messiah, and bring forth *fruits meet for repentance*, Mat. 3. When the apostles baptized 3000 in Jerusalem, they only received and baptized those who had *gladly received the word*, Acts 2, 41. When Philip preached to the Samaritans, he only baptized those who *believed* the gospel which he delivered, Acts 8, 12. Likewise the Eunuch, who was a proselyte to the Jews religion, and might have been recieved by that Jewish custom our author talks of, when he *professes faith in Christ* (not before) Philip baptizes him. And the same method they observed when they went among the Gentiles ; that is, to baptize only such as *received the Holy Ghost*, Acts 10 so that it appears as plain as the sun in his meridian splendor, that whether among Jews, Gentiles, or proselytes, they acted up to their commission, which was to baptize such and such only as were made disciples by the ministry of the word.

The next thing that presents itself is *household baptism*. The Methodist, in p. 29, brings the Anabaptist to a confession of his faith ; “ *is it not one of your principles*

that

that you must have express scripture proof or nothing? And don't you hold that people adult must be taught before baptism? Yes, all this we hold: "Then, Sir, upon your own principles I can prove that Lydia's family consisted of infants." Then without doubt he must bring express scripture proof of it. Upon this principle we stand; express scripture or nothing. But what scripture has he brought, upon these principles, to prove that Lydia's family consisted of infants? Why, not a single sentence, except of his own making. "In Acts 16. 15. we have plain scripture, that Lydia's family was baptized." Yes, but not that it consisted of infants, take notice. "But I must not say the members of her family were taught or believed." Neither must you say they were infants; or that they were not taught and believed. "For this, on your principles, you must deny." Not so fast. Why must we deny they were taught and believed? "Because there is not the least shadow of scripture to prove they were taught or believed." What! not the least shadow of scripture to prove that they were taught, when the commission required teaching in order to baptism! Not the least shadow of scripture to prove that they believed, when faith was required as a necessary qualification in the subject of it! Acts 8. 37: What! not the least shadow, &c. when the conduct of those who were under the guidance of the unerring Spirit in this respect must be uniform and consistent! Profound reasoning indeed! to say the truth, there is not the least shadow of scripture, much less express scripture, to prove that Lydia's family consisted of infants, or were so under her controul, as to be baptized by her will. But what he lacks in argument he makes up in confidence, and concludes, "So that upon your own principles, I have fairly proved the baptism of infants." With greater truth and propriety, he might have said, "I have fairly proved the weakness of my cause, the futility of my arguments, and my design to mislead the weak and beguile unstable souls."

From what this author says, we must believe he has read his Bible; but from his argument, I must believe he does

does not understand it : For if he did he might easily see that infants are not necessarily included in the term *household*, admitting they in reality pertain to the family : As the scripture uses the term *household* to signify the principal part of the family. This is evident from 1 Sam. 1. 21. *Elkanah and all his house went up*, that is the principal part thereof, *but Hannah went not up*, v. 22. nor the child *Samuel*. Again, 2 Sam. 15. 16. *The king went forth and all his household after him*, yet we are immediately told, *the king left ten women to keep the house*, and doubtless the infants were left in their care, as it is hardly supposable, they joined with his servants and men of war in a speedy march, v. 14, 15. So that *Lydia and her household*, that is, the principal part of her family, might be baptized, and yet no infant be baptized if she had any. Before this can be admitted as a proof for infant baptism, it should be made appear that she was a married woman, had children, and that they were baptized ; neither of which can. Her condition, whether maid, wife or widow, is not determined, as she is said to be a certain woman. The place of her abode was *Thyatira*, a city of Asia. Being a seller of purple she was now at *Phillippi*, the capitol of *Macedonia*, a province of *Greece*, in *Europe*, some hundreds of miles distant from the place of her residence. If she had a husband, is it not unlikely that she should come so far from home, and leave him there ; or that she should assume the headship and take the management of the trade upon herself ? If she had young children, can it be supposed that she would have exposed them to all the dangers of different weather, in a long journey by sea and land. It is most likely her household consisted of servants who drove the horses, camels or asses, which carried the merchandize, and assisted her in the sale and delivery of it ; or sons who might be her partners or assistants ; or even daughters who might be trained to business. Infants are not an essential part of every household, as thousands of families have no infants in them. And the circumstance mentioned, Acts 16. 40, of the apostles entering into the house of *Lydia* and comforting the

the brethren, makes against the notion of her family consisting of infants, as he won't say the apostles comforted them, and the scriptures mention none being there besides those of her own house; nor do we pretend to say they were all *men and not women*: it is a whimsey of this author's to confine the term *brethren* to males only, it being a word of *common gender* including both the sexes; as a multitude of scriptures evince. So that believers baptism stands firm and unshaken so far.

He says * that their ministers practise household baptism, and ours do not; therefore they are right and we are wrong. But this arises from another of his mistakes. We have many whole families in our community which have been baptized upon profession of their faith. And if he disputes it, he shall have their names and the place of their residence.

For further support of his household baptism, as including infants, he cites 1 Cor. 7. 14. "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife; and *vice versa*—else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." † He finds great fault with our explaining those terms by *legitimate* and *illegitimate*, and asks, "Where is there an example in scripture of unclean, signifying an illegitimate birth? or of holy, signifying a child born in lawful wedlock?" And now tickled with the conceit of having us in a noose, says, "Is not such an explanation suited to tempt a smile at the embarrassment of writers with an obstinate text?" That Pedobaptist writers have been sadly embarrassed with this obstinate text, is manifest from the variety of explanations they have given it, torturing it to make it vouch for infant baptism, which it is *too obstinate* ever to do; as it appears by the *evidence* of the whole chapter, never to have held the least correspondence with baptism.

It is no force upon the text to apply the terms *sanctified* and *holy* to a matrimonial sanctification and holiness, because it agrees exactly with the apostle's scope; and in Deut. 23. 2. we find illegitimate persons treated as unclean, not being permitted to enter into the congregation

E

gation of the Lord. I suppose he will not say the terms mentioned mean internal sanctification or holiness ; and as he rejects our interpretation, he is forced to suppose they imply *the separation of any thing to a holy or sacred use* ; as the vessels of the temple, the victims for sacrifice, the holy nation of Israel, and the holy tribe of Levi. But though the scriptures plainly declare in what respects and to what privileges all these were sanctified and made holy ; yet it determines nothing about the privileges of the children of a believing parent with regard to any gospel ordinance, in distinction from the children of wicked parents, whom this gentleman excludes as unfit. Yet, tho' the scriptures in general, and this text in particular, speak nothing at all about it, this author thinks himself qualified to fill up the blank, and then finds *baptism* there very easily. But methinks, Rev. 22. 18, *If any man shall add, &c.* should have been a check to his temerity.

But he seems to have forgotten the *sanctified yet unbelieving* husband or wife, who is equally entitled to *the blessed privileges of the church*, with the *holy* child, if this text is to settle the right of persons to church-ordinances. I therefore enter a caveat against his explanation till he clears up that dark affair. And if he allows the one term to mean *matrimonial sanctification* ; he may quit smiling at us for explaining the other, of a *matrimonial holiness*.

We come next to the house of the Jailor. § He begins with making the Anabaptist misquote a passage in the dialogues, and then adds, “ He (the author) set out with saying there is scripture enough to prove there were no infants in the jailor’s household”—Hold fit ! you are going intirely upon a *false scent* ! he says, the scripture says enough to prove that there were no infants BAPTIZED in his household. So that in what follows concerning *Mr. A’s* congregation at *Mr. B’s*, he is only fighting with his own shadow, or rather is confuting himself. He supposes he might say *Mr. A.* preached a sermon at *Mr. B’s*—that he spake the word of

of the Lord to *all* that were in his house ;— that the sermon had a great effect upon *all* the congregation— that they *all* rejoiced in the Lord, and that the preacher rejoiced with them—and yet infants be there—Granted. This exactly corresponds with what I have mentioned concerning the households of David and Elkanah. But were it to be inferred from that account, that infants were included as a part of the household which was preached to, or the congregation which rejoiced, we should require proof of *that*.

His other illustrations are of a colour with this, and serve to confirm, what Scripturist mentioned the salutation of Paul to the household of Onesiphorus for, viz. To shew that households are not necessarily taken as *comprising* infants ; because a gentleman who gives his respects to Mr. N. and his family, does not mean the infants in it. And, when we say of any family, *it is an exceeding happy family* ; that all join together in the worship of God, &c. we are under a necessity of *excluding* infants from *these ideas* of such a household.

And now what becomes of his proof for infant baptism from the household of the jailor and Stephanas ? the same household, that was *preached to*, and that the jailor *believed with*, was the identical household that was *baptized*.

And if *baptism* is predicated of the household of Stephanus, 1 Cor. 1. 1. so is their being the *first fruits of Achaia*, and their *addicting themselves to the ministry of the saints*. So that if there were infants in these households who were *not preached to*—that could not by reason of their tender age *believe*—nor addict themselves to the ministry of the saints, it follows clearly that there might be infants there, and they not baptized neither : Though, which is still worse for his cause, there is not the least *hint* of an infant being in either of those households. *So all his proof is gone again and he is as far out at sea as ever*.

The terrible instances of Uzzah, Nadab and Abihu, who were struck with immediate death for a deviation from the appointments of heaven, are treated by this
author

author as scare-crows. * But though God himself has in his word hung them up in *terrorem*, this author makes them the subject of his banter, † by representing the Antipedo-Baptist writers *dragging in poor Uzzah and his cart*. “He has never seen any body lose his life for having his child baptized,” and therefore he assumes courage to venture on. “*We are not to be scared out of* (he should have said *into*) *our duty by these far-fetched stories.*” § Not so far fetched but they are written for his learning, Rom. 15. 4. But, says he, “I believe it would puzzle a philosopher to find out any connection between Uzzah’s cart and infant baptism. ||” For my part I do not conceive it to be so difficult a task, as to require any great share of *philosophy*, to shew wherein there is too much connection by way of familiarity between them.—Uzzah’s cart was a *human invention*; so is infant sprinkling.—Uzzah’s cart was a *violation* of the due order; 1 Chron. 15. 13; so is infant sprinkling.—Uzzah’s cart was used for *fleshy convenience*; infant sprinkling has obtained for the same reason.—Uzzah’s cart had the *multitude* on its side; so has infant sprinkling.—Uzzah’s cart was carried along by *beastly force*; so has infant sprinkling made its way by *worldly power and persecution*.—A seeming plea might have been made for Uzzah’s cart, that the end being answered thereby, no matter for the *circumstances*; the same has been plead in favour of infant sprinkling.—Whatever end the people might propose in fixing up Uzzah’s cart, it was *no acceptable service to God*; so *in vain* do men worship him, teaching for doctrine that principal *tradition* of men, infant sprinkling.—Finally, as Uzzah’s cart was at length *laid aside*, and gave place to the *due order*; so, we hope, doctrines and ordinances will at length be reduced to the *primitive apostolical standard*, and infant sprinkling be no more.

Ana. “Nadab and Abihu though were destroyed for doing what the Lord commanded them not.”—

Metbo. “The Anabaptists, for want of a better, have made

made great use of this text, *I commanded them not.*---The words are found in Jeremiah, &c."---Now had this Rev. gentleman been a little better acquainted with his Bible, he would have known they were to be found in Lev. 10, 1, and that they were particularly applied to the circumstance of Nadab and Abihu's offering strange fire; and so might have saved himself the trouble of leading his reader a wild-goose-chase to the 7th of Jeremiah, and the fire of tophet; as well as his curious remarks on a scripture the Baptists, perhaps, never thought of using in this controversy, as they are in no want of others that better serve their purpose. But he objects * to the Scare-crow made out of *Nadab and Abihu* (as he called it) as not being a *parallel case*. Why not? "the particular *fire* they were to offer was *specified*, but they would not *do* as they were *commanded*." Well the case is parallel. The particular *subjects* and *mode* is *specified*, and they will not *do* as they are *commanded*.---But "if our ministers, instead of *water* as commanded, should use *brandy, rum* or *tar*, the observation would be something better." No. If your ministers, instead of dipping a professing believer, sprinkles an infant, the observation is *equally* good; as the proper subject and mode is doubtless to be as much regarded as the *material* made use of in the administration.

Ana. "One plain text would have settled the controversy." † Now if this writer had been as willing to have settled the controversy as he pretends, why did he not give his plain scripture if he had any, and so have settled the point? but not being able to do that, he makes use of one of his old shifts, and impertinently turns it off by saying, "but it is your *misfortune* that you have not got *one text on your side, plain or not plain*. You can't produce *one* for your life."---I must confess upon reading such passages as these, which frequently occur in the argument, I was not a little surprised to find it possible for a person professing the least regard to sacred truth, to prevail upon himself to publish them in a land of Bibles. Let any person

only

only read over the texts I have already produced, and he may easily see what epithet belongs to such bare-faced assertions.

According to this author, as infants were from Abraham taken into the church with their parents; so if Christ had not been minded to continue them with their parents in the church under the gospel dispensation, *there would have been a necessity for an express mention of it.*"* But we are to remember that gospel churches are not *national* but *congregational*; not to be composed of infants but of faithful men: Nor are gospel ordinances framed after the model of those which God is said to *find fault with*, Heb. 8. 8; which Christ has *abolished*, Ephe. 2. 15; and taken out of the way and nailed to his cross, Col. 2. 14. The gospel dispensation is a *new* one, and not the old one *new vamped*.

Having failed to accomplish his design so far, the next thing he attempts is to work a miracle, by casting out a devil §---“ If I could be so fortunate as to drive this *disputing devil* from among you, it would be much to your advantage.”--- I thank him for his good-will--- but I can't for his charity---for it seems he has none for us: And had he seen Paul who for three months *disputed* in the synagogue, Acts 19. 8; and afterwards *disputed daily* in the school of Tyrannus, v. 9, he might have drawn conclusions equally to his prejudice. He may cease to exclaim against us for want of christian charity as he has done,† seeing there is so little of it manifest in his piece. But, however good his design may be, I expect he will be as *unfortunate* as some of his brother craftsmen were who tried the project once before, Acts 19. 13, 14, 15, 16. There was a noble company of them, *vagabond Jews, Exorcists, seven sons of Sceva*, and *the chief of the priests*, who did so. No wonder the *priests* joined in this business, for they have generally been very officious on such occasions. Well, these, to feed their ambition and aggrandize their reputation, fall to casting out Devils! However, they soon met with their match! Whether this Devil was a worldly minded

minded one; who would not subscribe largely to them, or whether he was a *disputing* one, is not positively said ---but he appears to have been the latter; for he *disputed* the point with them, and that manfully too. For, having neither the authority of *Christ* nor his *apostles*, (the case of this author exactly) the *Lord* refused to own them in their work. This *disputatious* devil, cries *Jesus, I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?* And by the assistance of the man, in whom this devil was, these champions were *prevailed against* and made to *flee*. This, methinks, might have been a caution to this *priest* not to have meddled; as he appears to have no great strength for the combat.

But, *seriously*, it was an odd affair to censure the Baptists, as he does, for disputing, when at the very instant he was engaged in a disputation, and on the wrong side too. Could he suppose people would look upon *disputation* to be a *devil* in the Baptists, and an *angel* in himself? Besides, he ought to have considered that he is a *Methodist*; and there are no people, among us, who spend so much of their time in disputing, railing, abusing, censuring, and condemning of other denominations, as they do.

We have next some curious remarks on a quotation from the 32d page of the dialogues, "Wherever Christ commands the baptizing believers, there is an implicit prohibition of all others not so qualified; for every affirmative command includes a negative." You *ought*, says he, *to produce your affirmatives*.---Sir, they are at your service. When Christ gave his apostles commission, Matt. 28. 19, to *teach* or make disciples, baptizing them; it is an affirmative command, to baptize those whom they made disciples by teaching. Peter affirmatively commanded the people on the day of Pentecost to *repent* and be baptized, Acts 2. 38, and those at Cesarea, who had received the Holy Ghost, were also affirmatively commanded by him to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. The same is also the case with those words of Ananias to converted Saul, *arise and be baptized*. As to the text he supposes we had

our eye upon, Mark 16. 16, He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.---He denies there is any command in it at all. "It only contains a *condition of salvation*." But unless baptism be as much a condition of salvation as believing, his assertion, "*it contains only a condition of salvation*," falls to the ground. But as it is universally agreed that these words in Mark relate to the *same commission* recorded by Matthew, there is no dispute but there is a *command* included in it, and *believing* and *baptism* can with no propriety be *connected* together in the commission, otherwise than to point out the persons qualified for, and who had a right to that ordinance.

He says "it is not true that every affirmative command implies a negative." How does he make that out? Why, "*honour thy father and mother* is a positive command, and if it implies a negative, then it is a sin to honour rulers, magistrates, &c." But we are bound by another positive command to honour rulers, magistrates, &c. and it never came into our heads that one positive command implied an *exclusion* of all others. But to set him right, *honour thy father and mother*, implies that we must not alienate the honour which is peculiarly due to them, so as to withdraw it from them and bestow it upon any other person whatever. But "we have a positive command to keep the seventh day of the week a holy sabbath---yet you and I keep the first day of the week." Have we a positive command to *keep the seventh day* of the week? an *unrepealed* command? a command which *binds* us as it did the *Jews*? and yet a command that we may treat with neglect, and lawfully act directly *contrary* to? I shall leave him to get through this dark business as well as he can. For my part I am not concerned in it.

The next thing to be examined is the *mode* of baptism. The Anabaptist being put to prove baptism by immersion, quotes Mark 1. 5. John did baptize in Jordon, John 3. 23. John was baptizing in *Enon*, be-
cause

cause there was much water there, &c.---Methodist. *That's nothing to me.**—Why, in one sense, that's true. If those passages and several others, were *expunged* from the sacred pages, his practice would have as much support from the scripture as it has at present. However, if he won't be *John's disciple*, one would think he might be *Christ's*, and walk in *that way* of the Lord which *John* as his forerunner was sent to prepare. He says "it would puzzle us to prove that *John* had them *all over* in the water."†---We know it has sadly puzzled all his party to furnish out a single reason, *why* *John* should chuse places where there was *much water* for the purpose of baptizing if it was not that he might (as he chuses to phrase it) have them *all over in the water*. But as he does not *deny* that *John* dipped his disciples and offers no other explanation of those texts; I shall let them stand as they are; they are plain, and speak for themselves.

But he is satisfied that Philip did not dip the Eunuch. And what is it that *satisfies* him? Why, "one Mr. Sanders, and also one Charles Thompson, who were both there, say, the water is not six inches deep; and therefore it was not possible for a man to be dipped in it."---To this *very satisfying* account of the matter, he makes his Anabaptist reply, "*But we must not take any thing from man.*" But, though we must not take our principles of faith and rules of practice from man, we do not object against the *testimony* of men concerning *well-attested facts*. However we should be glad to know what rule Mr. Sanders and Charles Thompson had to be assured they were at the *very* place; especially as the sacred historian does not determine it, but says only *they came to a certain water*. What pity it is this author had not took a little more from man and given us the *very words* of these travellers, and cited us to the *page* where they might be found, that we might all be *satisfied* as well as he! From the manner in which he mentions them; one Mr. Sanders and one Charles Thompson, we should naturally be led to imagine they were persons of great ob-

scurity

curity and little credit. I never heard of any person named *Sanders*, who published his travels, and perhaps he only had heard of one *Sandys*, and mistook the name for *Sanders* from the similarity of sound. And it is but charity to him to suppose he has only heard of *Charles Thompson*. I have now before me *the travels of the late Charles Thompson*, esq; and as I suppose he is the gentleman this author means, it is but justice to him to quote the passage from his *travels*, however hard it may bear upon the credit of this author, for misrepresenting him, to say no worse, as he has done.

“ We came—says Mr. Thompson, to the fountain, where *they tell us* that *Philip* baptized the *Ethiopian Eunuch*; but *two reasons* induce me to believe, that this is *not the place*. First, the road is very steep and craggy, and *scarce passable* for a man on horseback; and appears to be much less so for a *chariot*, such as the *Eunuch* rode in, or any wheel-carriage whatsoever. Secondly, the spring is very shallow and inconsiderable, scarce affording water enough to reach ones ankles; and therefore *cannot reasonably be supposed to be the place* where *Philip* and the *Eunuch* went both into the water, according to the scripture account of the matter; unless we may conjecture that the *baptism* in question was performed in a basin or reservoir at some distance below this fountain, where the little rill that flows from it is at present received.” Vol. 3d. p. 312. But let us attend to what the scriptures say---*they went down both into the water*. But says this author “ They went down out of the chariot, and they might stand in the water.” I suppose by this he means to insinuate, that they might go down and stand in the water for the conveniency of getting water to pour or sprinkle upon the *Eunuch*. But says Dr. Doddridge, “ It would be very unnatural to suppose, that *they went down to the water* merely that *Philip* might take up a little water in his hand to pour on the *Eunuch*; a person of his dignity had, no doubt, many vessels in his baggage, on such a journey thro’ so desert a country; a precaution absolutely necessary for travellers in those parts, and never

“ never omitted by them.”—Doddridge’s note on Acts. 8. 38.

But what was done is plainly told us, Acts 8. 38. 39. *And they went down both (not only out of the chariot but) into the water. And when they were come up out of the water, &c.* If they had not gone down into it, it could not have been said that they came up out of it. *And Philip baptized or dipped him; not rantized or sprinkled him.*—This was Calvin’s opinion, who on the text says, “*hic perspecimus, &c.* Here we see, what was the manner of baptizing with the ancients, for they plunged the whole body into water.” And that the original Greek word *baptizo*, to baptize, signifies to dip, plunge, or overwhelm, is the opinion of every Greek Lexicographer of note; and not only these, but commentators, and the greatest criticks in the original languages, always render the word *baptizo*, being a Greek word--- in its first and primary sense, by *mergo immergo*, to dip, or plunge into, and never by *perfundo* or *aspergo*, to pour or sprinkle. And this acknowledgement has been repeatedly made by the Pedobaptists themselves; and altho’ they practise the contrary, yet so clear is the truth that they freely own it.

It is therefore as great a solecism in language to call sprinkling a mode of baptism, as this author does, * as to call it a mode of bathing or washing the body in water.—Romans 6. 4. *Buried with him by baptism*, looks with such an ill aspect on his notion of sprinkling, that he labours to set aside its evidence. “It is not, says he, a literal but a metaphorical expression--- therefore nothing can be proved from it.” But if the metaphor is founded on an allusion to a real fact then in use, to wit, the putting persons under water in baptism, and raising them out of it, as those who sprinkled infants generally confess; then it proves all we want proved, viz. what was the *primitive practice*, which is what we wish to conform to.

“ But if the expression was taken literally, says he,

it would make as much or more for sprinkling or pouring as for plunging : for, in burying, the body is not plugged through the substance of the earth, but the earth is sprinkled or poured upon it." * Such pitiful stuff scarcely deserves notice. What person would conceive a body to be buried, if it had only a few grains of sand sprinkled on its face. And we know that it is an easy matter to bury persons in baptismal water without having recourse to sprinkling or pouring.

He says † he is satisfied that the apostles sprinkled those whom they baptized---because the 3000 and 5000 mentioned in Acts *must have been sprinkled*. Why must they ? " Good reasons have been assigned for their being sprinkled, by many writers, but I would only add this, (which I suppose is the best these writers have furnished him with) Mr. Fuller tells us, there were no water mills at Jerusalem, because there was no stream large enough to drive them. They had none but the gentle waters of Siloam ; so that the nature of the place as well as the number of the baptized, renders it plain enough that they were sprinkled." I cannot reply to this better than in the words of the author of *the plain account of the ordinance of baptism*. p. 29.

" We who are so little used to washing the whole body, either in a common or religious way, are apt to wonder, where, and how, such prodigious numbers, as are mentioned in the New Testament to be baptized, could be accommodated if they were immersed in water. But it needs only to be considered, the principal scene of baptism lay in a country where immersion was quite familiar, and must, by the very laws of their religion, come into daily use through all parts of the land ; and then the wonder will cease. For, as bishop Patrick observes, " There are so many washings prescribed [in the law of Moses] that it is reasonable to believe, there were not only at Jerusalem, and in all other cities, but in every village, several bathing places contrived for these legal purifications, that men might, without much la-

"bour

“hour, be capable to fulfil these precepts.” *Comment on Lev. xv. 12.*

But it is said “The cleansing from sin is represented by it.” * Then a person ought first to be cleansed by grace before he is baptized to represent it. But according to him this cleansing from sin cannot be so fitly represented by any other mode of baptism as by sprinkling; and for this purpose he quotes Ezek. 36. 25. *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean, &c.* Isa. 52. 25. *So shall he sprinkle many nations*—From which he thus reasons; “This cleansing us from all filthiness and sin is not the effect of the water, but of the Holy Spirit and of the Blood of Christ:—and those expressions of sprinkling us with the Spirit, pouring out the Spirit upon us, &c. being figurative, they must allude to some *likeness in nature*, with which we are acquainted.”--- † But I would ask him if he thinks these two prophets alluded to the practice of infant sprinkling? or if he means to put a cheat upon his readers and make them believe that they took their ideas of these expressions from sprinkling infants? or if there was any thing in nature of this Kind in their day with which they were acquainted, and from which they took their ideas? But it is plain the prophets alluded to no such thing, but to the sprinklings which were in use among the Jews on various occasions, and with which they were well acquainted, and unto which the apostles in the New Testament allude, Heb. 12. 24, *The Blood of Sprinkling*, 1 Pet. 1. 2, and *Sprinkling of the Blood of Christ*.

No one disputes but sprinkling was a ceremony of purification, though I do not remember where *mere* unmixed water was ever ordered to be sprinkled. But there are numerous places, where *bathing* or *washing the whole body* in water is expressly commanded. Now if we would know with which of these Jewish rites, the the New-Testament baptism symbolizes, “It falls out very remarkably, (says the author last quoted) that “the *only two* words which the *Greek* of the *Old Testa-*

F

“*ment*

“ *ment* makes use of to express the right of washing the
 “ *whole body*, as distinct from *all other* rites of sprink-
 “ *ling*, pouring, washing the hands and feet; both
 “ *these words*, and *only these*, are made use of in the
 “ *Greek of the New-Testament*, to specify, and determine
 “ *with precision*, the action of *baptizing*.” Plain
 account. P. 15.

He charges brother Harris * with having advanced a glaring contradiction in terms, because, he says, *the cross has frightened many good christians from the blessing attending a submission to this ordinance*. It is so far from a contradiction, that a christian may be frightened at the cross; that the scripture gives us an account of some christians who have been frightened into gross sins; though I don't say they were any the better for that. And as to baptism, numbers, who have been convinced of their duty in reference thereto, have not only lost the blessing attending a submission to this ordinance, but have severely repented it, even on their death beds; and have alledged the persuasion of friends, and fear of man, as the cause of their neglect. I find it is very difficult for us to please this gentleman at all. We must not have charity for any who neglect a submission to this ordinance with their eyes open; yet, if any of us hope there will be some period of the church when all christians will have their eyes opened and submit to our baptism, he exclaims, “ This is uncharitable indeed—what reasonable man can swallow this ?”

If he enquires after the blessing which attends this submission, I have largely answered that. Does he ask, *who hath required this at your Hands ?*---I answer, *Christ*; who has made it a part of that righteousness, which it becomes us to fulfil. And as *Christ* has never required the sprinkling of Infants; whenever he engages in that scriptureless business; he changes the ordinance, with respect to both the *subject* and *mode*.

“ We can't allow that baptism succeeds in the place of circumcision;” and though this author must know that it is the main hinge on which infant baptism is
 generally

generally made to turn; as *true* and as *plain* as it is to him, he brings no proof of any such succession; but taking it for granted, seems to blame us for not doing so too. But he should have remembered that it but ill became a professed *answerer* of the dialogues against infant baptism, to say “*no, no, you must take care how you give up that,*”* when, instead of “*taking in the whole substance of every objection*”† made in those dialogues, he silently passes over *Scripturist’s* ample and effectual confutation of *Traditionist* on that head. And till, according to his promise,§ he answers those objections, we shall still be of opinion that “The scriptures make it appear plain, that circumcision and baptism are two distinct ordinances, in two distinct administrations, and depend on two distinct institutions.” If therefore we would know who have a right to baptism, according to the scriptures, we ought to begin where the scripture begins with it, and not frame arguments from any thing before the Institution of baptism to prove it.”---see dial. p. 18.---As this is one among many arguments, which this author has not answered, I point it out to him to try his strength upon.

Neither has Dr. Gill said any thing “to shew that he looked upon baptism to answer the same end under the gospel as circumcision did under the law.”|| He was only shewing, “That water baptism, and a submission to it under the New testament, gave a person no right to, nor interest in the covenant of grace, even as circumcision did not nor could under the Old.” And now, is there any thing in these words that looks like he believed baptism “answered the same end under the gospel as circumcision did under the law?” It is evident, that he neither means nor intends any such thing; but only says, neither of these rites gave a person an interest in the covenant of grace. See his exp. on Cant. quart. edi. p. 135.

He asks † “If any were considered as members of the Jewish church, under the law, but such as were circumcised,” &c. He makes the Anabaptist say, *This*

is

is right. But I would ask him if there were no female members of the Jewish church? and I hope he will not pretend to say that they were circumcised. Besides, if positive institutions may be regulated by mere inference and *analogy*, the right of infants to the Lord's supper may be demonstrated, as children partook of the passover, Exo. 12. 4; which is generally called by the Pedobaptists one of the two sacraments of the Old Testament. However, enough (I will not say truth) *has dropped from his pen*, to shew that he did not look upon baptism to succeed in the room of circumcision, as according to him it must *succeed* in the place of *proselyte baptism* among the Jews,† and the baptism of the children unto *Moses* in the cloud and in the sea ||

We are § told that the ancient Waldenses, Albigeneses and Petrabrufians, held with infant baptism, and were Episcopalians; and that he has lately read the history of them, and can't find any such error among them as that of denying infant baptism. No wonder he should see nothing of this in a *martyrology*, written by a *Pedobaptist*, and *abridged* by Mr. Wesley; but if he had read their own confessions of faith, he might have found it very readily, and that they only baptized upon profession of faith. This Dr. Gill has demonstrated, from their own and others writings, in his answer to the divine right of infant baptism, p. 38. Speaking of the Waldenses, he says, "By their ancient confessions of faith and writings, which have been published, in one of these, bearing date A. D. 1120, the 12th and 13th articles run thus.* We do believe that the sacraments are signs of the holy thing, or visible forms of the invisible grace; accounting it good that the faithful sometimes use the said signs, or visible forms, if it may be done. However, we believe and hold, that the above said faithful may be saved without receiving the signs aforesaid, in case they have no place, or any means to use them." And in another ancient confession of faith without a date, the 7th article runs thus.

† P. 27. || P. 21. § P. 47, 48. * Morland's his. &c. b. 1. chap. 4. p. 34

thus. " We believe that in the sacrament of baptism, " water is the visible and external sign, which represents unto us that which (by the invisible virtue of " God operating) is within us; namely, the renovation of the spirit, and the mortification of our members in Jesus Christ; by which also we are received " into the holy congregation of the people of God, " there protesting and declaring openly our faith and " amendment of life."

From hence it is plain, that these people were for administering baptism to none but the *faithful*; and that none were received into the congregation of the people of God till they professed faith and amendment of Life, &c.— Besides these, a number of other passages are quoted by the doctor to confirm the same truth, which would be too tedious to transcribe.

He seems to be very unwilling to allow that the Baptist ministry was ever blest of God, either at or since the reformation; and in order to weaken the cause of believers baptism, he endeavours to hold us up in as contemptable a light as he can, and makes use of every mean artifice to supply the place of scripture and argument. The Baptists, he says,† hung as a dead weight upon the skirts of the reformation,—and that there is no clear account of our sect till about 235 years ago.— And asks if the reformation from Popery was brought about by the Anabaptists, &c?—But let me ask him if the reformation was brought about by Methodists or Arminians? Not at all.—Men who held with the doctrines of free and efficacious grace were raised up for that purpose. He ought to have considered, before he mentioned the reformation, how far he has dissented from it; and how great enemies he and his people are to the doctrines which God blest to effect this glorious event; for it is evident to all who are acquainted with the principles of the reformers, that they opposed and strove to reform the world as much from the principles of the Methodists as any thing whatever: So that instead of joining in with and carrying on the reformation

reformation as it was begun, they have turned about and are striving to dragg their hearers back into the same Popish tenets and doctrines which the Worthy Reformers bore a faithful testimony against. And supposing the Baptist church was but 235 years of age, that is a great deal older than the sect of the Methodists is; so that if there is any honour due to *old age* we are intitled to it.---But we are able to prove that there were many brave champions for the truth long *before* the time he refers to, who held with and practised believers baptism. However, the scriptures are sufficient to determine our judgment and practice in this matter; by which I would have every lover of the truth to abide.

He says, † “Many pious people believe the Baptists to hang as a dead weight on the skirts of true religion at the present day—they have met with too great success—and have beguiled numbers”—but how does this comport with his continuing a *mere morality-preacher*, till brother Harris went into his parish and set him an example of preaching evangelical doctrine; or with the account he gives of a Stir of religion about 35 miles out of his parish, in a letter to the society for promoting christian knowledge, in which, though the Baptists were the instruments, he seems well enough inclined to have gone off with the honour of it himself.

Another thing which this author cannot well digest is, that those preachers who oppose infant sprinkling “have not read their Bible through since they left school.” † Surely this author forgot that he has made his appearance under the character of a Methodist, or else he never would have given that hint, for fear of giving occasion for the application of the old proverb, *Physician heal thyself*. When the Methodists begin to run mad, in consequence of having too much learning, then, and not till then, need the Baptists quake for fear.---However, we have read it enough to know that infant baptism is not there, nor can this author prove it from thence. Nither has he answered the objections,

or

or confuted the arguments of Scripturist against infant, and for believers baptism ; but in numbers of places misquoted and misrepresented them.

And now, christian reader, I hope you will impartially weigh what I have written in defence of the baptism of believers by immersion. Say not that it is an *indifferent thing*. Whatever may be said of some *opinions, merely speculative*, yet surely no *gospel-duty* can properly be so termed. Will you call Christ *Lord!* and not *do* the things which he says? Will you call yourself his *disciple*, and not do *whatsoever* he commands you? Will you profess to be his *follower*, and not *walk in his steps*? Would you enjoy a *comfortable sense* of the divine presence? seek it in the way of *universal obedience*. Take *Christ's* yoke upon you and *learn of him*, for he is meek and lowley, and you shall find *rest* unto your soul.

Now the God of peace, who brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, make you perfect in *every good work* to do his will; Working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ; to whom be glory for ever and ever, amen.

F I N I S.









